

CYCLIC SYMMETRY AND ADIC CONVERGENCE IN LAGRANGIAN FLOER THEORY

KENJI FUKAYA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we use continuous family of multisections of the moduli space of pseudo holomorphic discs to partially improve the construction of Lagrangian Floer cohomology of [13] in the case of $\mathbb{R}$ coefficient. Namely we associate *cyclically symmetric* filtered A_∞ algebra to every relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold. We use the same trick to construct a local rigid analytic family of filtered A_∞ structure associated to a (family of) Lagrangian submanifolds. We include the study of homological algebra of pseudo-isotopy of cyclic (filtered) A_∞ algebra.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Kuranishi structure on the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic discs: review	4
3. Forgetfulmap compatible Kuranishi structure	11
4. Continuous family of multisections: review	17
5. Forgetfulmap compatible continuous family of multisections	21
6. Cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra and cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^E	24
7. Cyclic filtered A_∞ structure modulo T^E on de-Rham complex	27
8. Homological algebra of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra: statement	28
9. Pseudo-isotopy of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras	33
10. Canonical model of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra	39
11. Geometric realization of pseudo-isotopy of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras	45
12. Cyclic filtered A_∞ structure on de-Rham complex and on de-Rham cohomology	47
13. Adic convergence of filtered A_∞ structure	48
14. Pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies	52
References	56

1. INTRODUCTION

¹ In this paper we study de Rham version of Lagrangian Floer theory and use it to improve some of the results in [13] over $\mathbb{R}$ coefficient. In particular, in this paper, we prove Conjectures 3.6.46, 3.6.48 and a part of Conjecture T in [13] over $\mathbb{R}$ coefficient. Let L be a relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold in a symplectic

¹Supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.18104001 and Global COE Program G08.

manifold (M, ω) . In this paper we always assume that L is compact and M is either compact or convex at infinity.

The universal Novikov ring $\Lambda_{0, nov}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is defined in [13]. See also Definition 6.3. Let $H(L; \mathbb{R})$ be the (de Rham) cohomology group of L over $\mathbb{R}$ coefficient. We put $H(L; \Lambda_{0, nov}^{\mathbb{R}}) = H(L; \mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda_{0, nov}^{\mathbb{R}}$.

Theorem 1.1. *$H(L; \Lambda_{0, nov}^{\mathbb{R}})$ has a structure of unital filtered **cyclic** A_{∞} algebra which is well-defined up to isomorphism.*

Hereafter we work over $\mathbb{R}$ coefficient. So we write $\Lambda_{0, nov}$ in place of $\Lambda_{0, nov}^{\mathbb{R}}$. We denote by $\Lambda_{0, nov}^+$ its maximal ideal.

Let us explain the notions appearing in Theorem 1.1. We consider a (graded) anti-symmetric inner product $\langle \cdot \rangle$ on $H(L; \mathbb{R})[1]$ by

$$(1) \quad \langle u, v \rangle = (-1)^{\deg u \deg v + \deg u} \int_L u \wedge v$$

Filtered A_{∞} structure defines a map

$$\mathbf{m}_k : B_k(H(L; \Lambda_{0, nov})[1]) \rightarrow H(L; \Lambda_{0, nov})[1]$$

of degree one (for $k \geq 0$) such that

$$(2) \quad \sum_{k_1+k_2=k+1} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} (-1)^* \mathbf{m}_{k_1}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{x}_i, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i+k_2-1}), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = 0.$$

$*$ = $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \deg \mathbf{x}_{i-1} + i - 1$. (We require $\mathbf{m}_0(1) \equiv 0 \pmod{\Lambda_{0, nov}^+}$.)

The filtered A_{∞} structure is said to be unital if $\mathbf{e} = 1 \in H^0(L; \mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$(3a) \quad \mathbf{m}_k(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{x}_{i+2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = 0$$

for $k \neq 2$ and

$$(3b) \quad \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{x}) = (-1)^{\deg \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}).$$

The filtered A_{∞} structure is said to be cyclically symmetric or cyclic if

$$(4) \quad \langle \mathbf{m}_k(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle = (-1)^* \langle \mathbf{m}_k(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}), \mathbf{x}_k \rangle$$

$*$ = $(\deg \mathbf{x}_0 + 1)(\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \deg \mathbf{x}_k + k)$. Cyclically symmetric filtered A_{∞} algebra is said cyclic filtered A_{∞} algebra. See Remark 8.1 for the definition of isomorphism of cyclic filtered A_{∞} algebra.

Remark 1.1. (1) Except the statement on cyclicity, Theorem 1.1 was proved in [13] Theorem A. Actually in that case we may take $\mathbb{Q}$ in place of $\mathbb{R}$. They author does not know how to generalize Theorem 1.1 to $\mathbb{Q}$ (or $\Lambda_{0, nov}^{\mathbb{Q}}$) coefficient.

(2) The formula (4) is slightly different from Proposition 8.4.8 [13]. Also the sign in (1) is different from those explained in Remark 8.4.7 (1) [13]. Actually if we use sign convention in (1) then (4) becomes equivalent to one in Proposition 8.4.8 [13]. (See Lemma 6.1.) The author thanks C.-H Cho (See [2].) for this remark.

We next state our result about adic convergence. We take a basis $\mathbf{e}_i$ of $H(L; \mathbb{R})$ ($i = 0, \dots, b$) such that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_0 = 1 \in H^0(L; \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{b_1}$ are basis of $H^1(L; \mathbb{R})$ and other $\mathbf{e}_i$'s are basis $H^k(L; \mathbb{R})$, $k \geq 2$. For $\mathbf{x} \in H^{odd}(L; \Lambda_{0, nov})$ we put

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{x} = \sum x_i \mathbf{e}_i.$$

We introduce y_i ($i = 1, \dots, b_1$) by

$$(6) \quad y_i = e^{x_i} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} x_i^k.$$

(See Section 10 for a discussion of the convergence of the right hand side.) We consider

$$\sum_{k=0}^N \mathbf{m}_k(\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}) = P_N(\mathbf{x}).$$

We remark that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_N(\mathbf{x})$ converges in T adic topology if $x_i \in \Lambda_{0,nov}^+$. We used this fact to define Maurer-Cartan equation and its solution (bounding cochain) in [12]. We improve it as follows:

Theorem 1.2. (1) *If $x_i \in \Lambda_{0,nov}$ then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_N(\mathbf{x})$ converges. We denote its limit by $\mathbf{m}(e^{\mathbf{x}})$.*

(2) *$\mathbf{m}(e^{\mathbf{x}})$ depends only on $y_1, \dots, y_{b_1}, x_{b_1+1}, \dots, x_b$.*

(3) *There exists $\delta > 0$, such that $\mathbf{m}(e^{\mathbf{x}})$ extends to*

$$(7) \quad \{(x_0, y_1, \dots, y_{b_1}, x_{b_1+1}, \dots, x_b) \mid \delta > v(y_i) > -\delta, \\ v(x_0), v(x_{b_1+1}), \dots, v(x_b) > -\delta\}.$$

(4) *Let $\mathcal{M}(L)_\delta$ be the set of $(x_0, y_1, \dots, y_{b_1}, x_{b_1+1}, \dots, x_b)$ in the domain (7) such that $\mathbf{m}(e^{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$. Then there exists a family of strict and unital cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras parametrized by $\mathcal{M}(L)_\delta$.*

Here $v : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a valuation defined by

$$v\left(\sum a_i T^{\lambda_i}\right) = \inf\{\lambda_i \mid a_i \neq 0\}.$$

(Here we assume $a_i \in \mathbb{R}[e, e^{-1}]$ and $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ for $i \neq j$.)

A filtered A_∞ algebra is said to be strict if $\mathbf{m}_0 = 0$.

In [12] we considered the case $\mathbf{x} \equiv 0 \pmod{\Lambda_{0,nov}^+}$. In that case, we defined

$$(8) \quad \mathbf{m}_k^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = \sum_{m_0, \dots, m_k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{m}_{k+\sum_{i=0}^k m_i}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}^{\otimes m_k}).$$

Then $(H(L; \Lambda_{0,nov}), \mathbf{m}_k^{\mathbf{x}})$ is a filtered A_∞ algebra. It is unital or cyclic if $(H(L; \Lambda_{0,nov}), \mathbf{m}_k)$ is unital or cyclic, respectively. It is strict if and only if $\mathbf{m}(e^{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$.

Using the technique of [3], we can relax the condition $\mathbf{x} \equiv 0 \pmod{\Lambda_{0,nov}^+}$ to $\mathbf{x} \equiv 0 \in H^1(L; \Lambda_{0,nov})$. (See [14] where the case when M is toric is discussed.)

Theorem 1.2.4 says that we can further extend this story to the case of $\mathbf{x}$ contained in a larger domain. The convergence of (8) is one on T -adic topology. The convergence in Theorem 1.2.1 is different from T -adic topology and is a mixture of Archimedean and non-Archimedean topology. See Definition 13.1.

Our main theorems, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, are related as follows. In Theorem 1.2 it is essential that we can change variables from x_i to $y_i = e^{x_i}$. This becomes possible after we perform the whole construction of Kuranishi structure and its perturbation in a way compatible with the forgetful map. Then, for example, $\mathbf{m}_{3,\beta}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{m}_{3,\beta}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}_i) + \mathbf{m}_{3,\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_i)$ is related to $\mathbf{m}_{1,\beta}(\mathbf{x})$ by the formula

$$(9) \quad \mathbf{m}_{3,\beta}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{m}_{3,\beta}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}_i) + \mathbf{m}_{3,\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_i) = \frac{1}{2!} (\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i)^2 \mathbf{m}_{3,\beta}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Here $\mathbf{e}_i$ is a degree 1 cohomology class and β is an element of $H_2(X; \mathbb{Z})$. $\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}$ is the contribution of pseudo-holomorphic disc of homology class β to $\mathbf{m}_k$. (9) and a similar formulas make the change of coordinate $y_i = e^{x_i}$ possible.

Compatibility with forgetful map (which is the reason why (9) is correct) is also used to prove cyclic symmetry (4). It is used also to prove unitality (3).

Thus the main technical part of this paper is occupied to work out the way to construct Kuranishi structure and (abstract multivalued continuous family of) perturbations on it which is invariant of the process of forgetting boundary marked points. This construction is performed in Sections 2-5. We use it to prove a version of Theorem 1.1 (namely a version modulo T^E) in Sections 6-7. To go from this version to Theorem 1.1 we use a similar trick as one in [13] Chapter 7. We need to discuss some homological algebra of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra, which is in Section 8-10. In Section 11, we work out one parameter family version of the construction of Sections 2-5, which is used to prove well-definedness of the structure up to pseudo-isotopy. Theorem 1.1 then is proved in Section 12. (The proof of independence of choices is completed in Section 14.) In Section 13 we prove Theorem 1.2.

Our main result of this paper will have two applications.

One is to define a numerical invariant of (special) Lagrangian submanifold in Calabi-Yau 3 fold, which is a rational homology sphere. Roughly speaking it counts the number of pseudo-holomorphic discs with appropriate weights. This is invariant of perturbation and other choices but depends on almost complex structure. Existence of such an invariant was expected by several people especially by D. Joyce. For the rigorous construction it is essential to find a perturbation which is compatible with forgetful maps. Such a perturbation is provided in this paper. We will use it to define this invariant and discuss its properties in [8].

The other application is to define a (rigid analytic) family of Floer cohomologies. Actually the space $\mathcal{M}(L)_\delta$ in Theorem 1.2 is a chart of certain rigid analytic space. We can glue them up to define appropriate rigid analytic space. Then, by extending the construction of Theorem 1.2 to a pair (or triple etc.) of Lagrangian submanifolds, we can show that another Lagrangian submanifold L' gives an object of derived category of coherent sheaves on this rigid analytic space. This is a proof of a part of Conjecture U [13] and a step to realize the project to construct homological mirror functor by using family of Floer cohomology. (This project was started around 1998 in [5]. See also [4]. Its rigid analytic version was first proposed by [19].) The construction of rigid analytic family of Floer cohomology will be given by extending the construction of this paper in [9], there its application to mirror symmetry of torus in the form more general than [5] and [19] will be given. The story will be further generalized to include the case of singular fiber in [10], in dimension 2.

The author would like to thank Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono with whom he is happy to share many of the ideas of this paper.

2. KURANISHI STRUCTURE ON THE MODULI SPACE OF PSEUDO-HOLOMORPHIC DISCS: REVIEW

For the purpose of this paper, we need to take Kuranishi structure on the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic discs with some additional properties. We will construct such Kuranishi structure in the next section. In this section we review

definition of Kuranishi structure and the construction of it on the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic discs, which was due to [11].

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a compact space. A Kuranishi chart is $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$ which satisfies the following:

- (1) V_α is a smooth manifold (with boundaries or corners) and Γ_α is a finite group acting effectively on V_α .
- (2) $\text{pr}_\alpha : E_\alpha \rightarrow V_\alpha$ is a finite dimensional vector bundle on which Γ_α acts so that pr_α is Γ_α equivariant.
- (3) s_α is a Γ_α equivariant section of E_α .
- (4) $\psi_\alpha : s_\alpha^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a homeomorphism to its image, which is an open subset.

We call E_α an *obstruction bundle* and s_α a *Kuranishi map*. If $\mathbf{p} \in \psi_\alpha(s_\alpha^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_\alpha)$, we call $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$ a *Kuranishi neighborhood* of $\mathbf{p}$.

Let $\psi_{\alpha_1}(s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \cap \psi_{\alpha_2}(s_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}) \neq \emptyset$. A *coordinate transformation* from $(V_{\alpha_1}, E_{\alpha_1}, \Gamma_{\alpha_1}, \psi_{\alpha_1}, s_{\alpha_1})$ to $(V_{\alpha_2}, E_{\alpha_2}, \Gamma_{\alpha_2}, \psi_{\alpha_2}, s_{\alpha_2})$ is $(\hat{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}, \phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}, h_{\alpha_2\alpha_1})$ such that

- (1) $h_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}$ is an injective homomorphism $\Gamma_{\alpha_1} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\alpha_2}$.
- (2) $\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1} : V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \rightarrow V_{\alpha_2}$ is an $h_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}$ equivariant smooth embedding from a Γ_{α_1} invariant open set $V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$ to V_{α_2} , such that the induced map $\underline{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1} : V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1} \rightarrow V_{\alpha_2}/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}$ is injective.
- (3) $(\hat{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}, \phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1})$ is an $h_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}$ equivariant embedding of vector bundles $E_{\alpha_1}|_{V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}} \rightarrow E_{\alpha_2}$.
- (4) $\hat{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1} \circ s_{\alpha_1} = s_{\alpha_2} \circ \phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}$.
- (5) $\psi_{\alpha_1} = \psi_{\alpha_2} \circ \underline{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}$ on $(s_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0) \cap V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}$. Here $\underline{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}$ is as in 2.
- (6) The map $h_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}$ restricts to an isomorphism $(\Gamma_{\alpha_1})_x \rightarrow (\Gamma_{\alpha_1})_{\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(x)}$ between isotopy groups, for any $x \in V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$.
- (7) $\psi_{\alpha_1}(s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \cap \psi_{\alpha_2}(s_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}) = \psi_{\alpha_1}((s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0) \cap V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$

A *Kuranishi structure* on $\mathcal{M}$ assigns a Kuranishi neighborhood $(V_{\mathbf{p}}, E_{\mathbf{p}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}, \psi_{\mathbf{p}}, s_{\mathbf{p}})$ to each $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{M}$, such that if $\mathbf{q} \in \psi_{\mathbf{p}}(V_{\mathbf{p}}/\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}})$ then there exists a coordinate transformation $(\hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}, \phi_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}, h_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}})$ from $(V_{\mathbf{q}}, E_{\mathbf{q}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{q}}, \psi_{\mathbf{q}}, s_{\mathbf{q}})$ to $(V_{\mathbf{p}}, E_{\mathbf{p}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}, \psi_{\mathbf{p}}, s_{\mathbf{p}})$. We assume appropriate compatibility conditions among coordinate transformations, which we omit and refer to [16].

Let $\mathcal{M}$ have a Kuranishi structure. We consider the normal bundle $N_{\phi_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}(V_{\mathbf{q}})}V_{\mathbf{p}}$. We take the fiber derivative of the Kuranishi map $s_{\mathbf{p}}$ and obtain a homomorphism

$$d_{\text{fiber}s_{\mathbf{p}}} : N_{\phi_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}(V_{\mathbf{q}})}V_{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow E_{\mathbf{p}}|_{\text{Im}\phi_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}}$$

which is an $h_{\psi_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}}$ -equivariant bundle homomorphism. We say that the space with Kuranishi structure $\mathcal{M}$ has the *tangent bundle* if $d_{\text{fiber}s_{\mathbf{p}}}$ induces a bundle isomorphism

$$(10) \quad N_{\phi_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}(V_{\mathbf{q}})}V_{\mathbf{p}} \cong \frac{E_{\mathbf{p}}|_{\text{Im}\phi_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}}}{\hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}}(E_{\mathbf{q}})}.$$

We call a space with Kuranishi structure which has a tangent bundle a *Kuranishi space* or *K-space*.

We call a Kuranishi space to be oriented if $V_{\mathbf{p}}$ and $E_{\mathbf{p}}$ are oriented and if (10) is orientation preserving.

Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold of (real) dimension $2n$. We take an almost complex structure J , which is tamed by ω . For each $\alpha \in H_2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ and $\ell \geq 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha; J)$ the moduli space of stable J -holomorphic curve of genus zero with ℓ marked points and of homology class α . (In this paper we use only genus zero pseudo-holomorphic curve.) We sometimes write it as $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$. It has a Kuranishi structure of dimension $2(n + \ell - 3 + c^1(M) \cap \alpha)$. (See [16].)

Let L be a relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold of M . For each $\beta \in H_2(M, L; \mathbb{Z})$ and $\ell \geq 0, k \geq 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\ell, k}(\beta; L; J)$ the moduli space of bordered stable J -holomorphic curve of genus zero with ℓ interior marked points and k boundary marked points, one boundary component and of homology class β . We sometimes write it as $\mathcal{M}_{\ell, k}(\beta)$. In case $\ell = 0$ we write $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta)$ also. It has a Kuranishi structure with corner and boundary of dimension $2n + 2\ell + k - 3 + \mu(\beta)$, where $\mu : H_2(M, L; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a Maslov index. (See [11].)

Remark 2.1. In [11] we used compatible almost complex structure. However all the constructions there work for tame almost complex structure.

We review the construction of these Kuranishi structures since we need to modify them so that they have some additional properties, in the next section.

Let $\mathbf{p} = (\Sigma, v) \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell, k}(\beta; L; J)$ (resp. $(\Sigma, v) \in \mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha; J)$). Here Σ is a semi-stable marked bordered Riemann surface of genus 0 with one boundary component and $v : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \rightarrow (M, L)$ is a J -holomorphic map. (resp. Σ is a semi-stable marked Riemann surface of genus 0 and $v : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is a J -holomorphic map.) We assume that the enumeration of the boundary marked points respects the counter clockwise cyclic order of the boundary of Σ .

Remark 2.2. In [13] we wrote $\mathcal{M}_{\ell, k}^{\text{main}}(\beta; L; J)$. Here main means the compatibility of the enumeration of the boundary marked points with the counter clockwise cyclic order of the boundary of Σ . We omit this symbol in this paper since we only consider such Σ .

We consider decomposition

$$(11) \quad \Sigma = \bigcup_{a \in A} \Sigma_a$$

to irreducible components. Here Σ is either a disc or a sphere component. (resp. is a sphere component.) Let $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ be a finite group consisting of bi-holomorphic maps $\varphi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that $v \circ \varphi = v$.

We choose an open set U_a for each Σ_a . We may choose them so that they are $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ invariant in an obvious sense. We also assume that the closure $\bar{U}_a$ does not intersect with the boundary, marked points or singular points. Let Λ^{01} be a bundle on the disjoint union $\sqcup \Sigma_a$ of $(0, 1)$ forms. We are going to take a finite dimensional vector spaces

$$(12) \quad E_a \subset C_0^\infty(U_a; v^*TM \otimes \Lambda^{01})$$

and take its direct sum $E_a^0 = \bigoplus_{a \in A} E_a$ as a ‘tentative choice’ of the obstruction bundle. The explanation of this choice of E_a is in order. (The right hand side of (12) denotes the space of compactly supported smooth sections of the pull back bundle v^*TM on U_a .)

We take a positive integer p and consider the space of sections $W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a, v^*TM)$ of the pull-back bundle v^*TM on Σ_a of $W^{1,p}$ -class. We choose p sufficiently large

so that element of $W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a, v^*TM)$ is continuous on Σ_a . In case when Σ_a has a boundary we put boundary condition

$$(13) \quad \xi|_{\partial\Sigma_a} \subset W^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\Sigma_a, v^*TL)$$

and denote by $W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a, v^*TM; v^*TL)$ the space of ξ satisfying (13). By taking p large we may assume the restriction to $\partial\Sigma_a$ is also continuous. We write $W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a, v^*TM; v^*TL) = W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a, v^*TM)$ in case Σ_a is a sphere component.

We now consider the sum

$$(14) \quad \bigoplus_a W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a, v^*TM; v^*TL).$$

We require the following additional condition at the singular points. Let p be a singular point. There exist Σ_{a_1} and Σ_{a_2} ($a_1 \neq a_2$) with $p \in \Sigma_{a_1} \cap \Sigma_{a_2}$. (Using the fact that Σ has only nodal point as a singularity and that genus is 0, there exist such a_1, a_2 uniquely.) We now require $(\xi_a) \in \bigoplus_a W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a, v^*TM; v^*TL)$ to satisfy

$$(15) \quad \xi_{a_1}(p) = \xi_{a_2}(p).$$

We denote by

$$(16) \quad W^{1,p}(\Sigma, v^*TM; v^*TL)$$

the subspace of (14) of the elements (ξ_a) satisfying (15) at every singular point p .

Let Λ^{01} be a bundle on $\cup \Sigma_a$ of $(0, 1)$ forms. We put

$$(17) \quad L^p(\Sigma, v^*TM \otimes \Lambda^{01}) = \bigoplus_a L^p(\Sigma_a, v^*TM \otimes \Lambda^{01}).$$

The linearization of the pseudo-holomorphic curve equation defines an operator

$$(18) \quad D_v \bar{\partial} : W^{1,p}(\Sigma, v^*TM; v^*TL) \rightarrow L^p(\Sigma, v^*TM).$$

(18) is a Fredholm operator.

Definition 2.1. We say (Σ, v) is *Fredholm regular* if (18) is surjective.

In case (Σ, v) is Fredholm regular we can take its neighborhood in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{\ell}(\alpha; J)$) so that it is an orbifold with boundary/corner (resp. orbifold). In general we need to take obstruction bundle $E_{\mathbf{p}}$. We consider the finite dimensional subspaces E_a as in (12). We require that $\bigoplus_a E_a$ is $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ invariant.

Definition 2.2. We say that $((\Sigma, v), (E_a))$ is *Fredholm regular* if

$$(19) \quad \text{Im } D_v \bar{\partial} + \bigoplus_a E_a = L^p(\Sigma, v^*TM).$$

Under this assumption we will construct a Kuranishi neighborhood of $\mathbf{p}$. We introduce the following notation (Definition 2.3) for convenience. We attach each of the tree of sphere components to the disc component to which the component is rooted. Let

$$(20) \quad \Sigma = \bigcup_{b \in B} \Sigma_b = \bigcup_{b \in B} \bigcup_{a \in A_b} \Sigma_a$$

be the resulting decomposition. (Here $\bigcup_b A_b = A$.)

Definition 2.3. The choice of (E_a) is said to be *component-wise* if E_a depends only on $(\Sigma_a, v|_{\Sigma_a})$ and is independent of other components or the restriction of v to other components.

The choice of (E_a) is said to be *disc-component-wise* if E_a depends only on $(\Sigma_{a'}, v|_{\Sigma_{a'}})$ with $a, a' \in A_b$ so some b , and is independent of the components $(\Sigma_{a'}, v|_{\Sigma_{a'}})$ with $a' \notin A_b$ where $a \in A_b$.

Before reviewing the construction of Kuranishi neighborhood for Fredholm regular $((\Sigma, v), (E_a))$ we need to discuss the stability of the domain. We here follow [16] appendix. Let Σ_a be a component of Σ . We remark that we include marked or singular points to the notation Σ_a . Namely Σ_a is a marked disc or marked sphere where its marked points are either singular or marked point of Σ which is on Σ_a . We say that Σ_a is *stable* if its automorphism group is of finite order. (In case of disc component it is equivalent to $k_a + 2\ell_a \geq 3$ where k_a is the number of boundary marked points and ℓ_a is the number of interior marked points. In case of sphere component it is equivalent to $\ell_a \geq 3$.)

If Σ_a is not stable we add some interior marked points and make it stable. We denote it by Σ_a^+ . Note that $v|_{\Sigma_a}$ is nontrivial (in case Σ_a is unstable), since (Σ, v) is stable. Therefore $v|_{\Sigma_a}$ is an immersion at the generic point. We assume that v is an immersion at the additional marked points. We glue them and obtain Σ^+ . Let $\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$ be the set of the marked points we add.

We require that $\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$ are invariant of the $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ action. Namely we assume that none of the nontrivial element of $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ fix any of $p \in \text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$ and $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ exchanges elements of $\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$.

For each added marked point $p \in \text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$ we take $2n - 2$ dimensional submanifold $XM_p \subset M$ such that $XM_p \subset M$ intersect with $v : \Sigma_a \rightarrow M$ transversally at $v(p)$. (Here Σ_a is a component containing p .) We also require that if $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ then $XM_p = XM_{\gamma(p)}$.

Now we start with (Σ, v) and consider (Σ^+, v) . We take $E(\Sigma^+, v) = \bigoplus E_a(\Sigma^+, v)$ such that $((\Sigma^+, v), E(\Sigma^+, v))$ is Fredholm regular. We remark that all the components of Σ^+ are now stable. Let $U(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+)$ be a neighborhood of Σ^+ in the moduli space of marked bordered Riemann surface of genus zero and with one boundary component (resp. marked Riemann surface of genus 0). It is an orbifold with boundary or corners. We write

$$U(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+) = V(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+)/\text{Aut}(\Sigma^+)$$

where $V(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+)$ is a manifold with boundary or corner and $\text{Aut}(\Sigma^+)$ is a finite group of automorphism of Σ^+ . By our choice of $\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$ the group $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ of automorphisms of (Σ, v) is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma^+)$.

Let $\mathbf{v} \in V(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+)$ and $\Sigma^+(\mathbf{v})$ be the corresponding marked bordered Riemann surface of genus 0. $\Sigma^+(\mathbf{v})$ minus small neighborhood of ‘neck region’ is canonically isomorphic to Σ^+ minus small neighborhood of singular point. (See [16] Section 12.) Therefore the support U_a of E_a for each $E_a = E_a(\Sigma^+, v)$ has a canonical embedding to $\Sigma^+(\mathbf{v})$. (Note we use here the fact $\mathbf{v}$ is an element of $V(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+)$ not just an element of $U(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+)$.) We consider $v' : (\Sigma^+(\mathbf{v}), \partial\Sigma^+(\mathbf{v})) \rightarrow (M, L)$ which is C^0 close to v .

To define this C^0 closed-ness precisely we proceed as follows. We decompose

$$\Sigma^+ = \Sigma_{\text{reg}}^+ \cup \Sigma_{\text{sin}}^+$$

where the second term is a small neighborhood (ϵ -neighborhood) of the singular point. We then decompose

$$\Sigma^+(\mathfrak{v}) = \Sigma_{\text{reg}}^+(\mathfrak{v}) \cup \Sigma_{\text{sin}}^+(\mathfrak{v})$$

where $\Sigma_{\text{reg}}^+(\mathfrak{v})$ is biholomorphic to Σ_{reg}^+ . (For each ϵ we may take $V(\text{defresolv}; \Sigma^+)$ small enough so that such decomposition exists.) We may assume $U_a(\Sigma^+, v) \subset \Sigma_{\text{reg}}^+$ and hence $U_a(\Sigma^+, v) \subset \Sigma_{\text{reg}}^+(\mathfrak{v})$. Now v' is said to be ϵ close to v if:

- (1) $\text{dist}(v(x), v'(x)) \leq \epsilon$, if $x \in \Sigma_{\text{reg}}^+ = \Sigma_{\text{reg}}^+(\mathfrak{v})$.
- (2) The diameter of the v' image of each connected component of $\Sigma_{\text{sin}}^+(\mathfrak{v})$ is smaller than ϵ .

Now for v' which is ϵ close to v we define $E(\Sigma^+(\mathfrak{v}), v')$ as follows. For U_a we consider the isomorphism

$$(21) \quad C^\infty(U_a; v^*TM) \cong C^\infty(U_a; v'^*TM)$$

by taking parallel transport along the minimal geodesic joining $v(x)$ to $v'(x)$. (If ϵ is smaller than injectivity radius of M such minimal geodesic exists uniquely.) Using (21) we regard $E_a(\Sigma^+, v)$ as a subspace of $L^p(\Sigma^+(\mathfrak{v}); v'^*TM)$. Now we consider

$$(22) \quad V^+(\mathbf{p}) = \{(\mathfrak{v}, v') \mid v' : (\Sigma^+(\mathfrak{v}), \partial\Sigma^+(\mathfrak{v})) \rightarrow (M, L) \text{ is } \epsilon \text{ close to } v \text{ and satisfies (23) below.}\}$$

$$(23) \quad \bar{\partial}v' \in \bigoplus_a E_a(\Sigma^+, v).$$

The following is a consequence of standard glueing analysis. (See [11].)

Proposition 2.1. *If $((\Sigma^+, v), E(\Sigma^+, v))$ is Fredholm regular and ϵ is sufficiently small then $V^+(\mathbf{p})$ is a smooth manifold with boundary and corner.*

We next define evaluation map at added marked point. Namely we define

$$(24) \quad ev^{\text{int, add}} : V^+(\mathbf{p}) \rightarrow M^{\#(\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+))}$$

by

$$(\mathfrak{v}, v') \mapsto (v'(p_1), \dots, v'(p_{\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)})).$$

Using the fact that v is immersion and is transversal to XM_p for each $p \in \text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$ it follows that the fiber produce

$$(25) \quad V_{\mathbf{p}} = ev^{\text{int, add}}_{ev^{\text{int, add}}} \times_{M^{\#(\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+))}} \prod_{p \in \text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)} XM_p$$

is transversal. In particular $V_{\mathbf{p}}$ is a smooth manifold with corners. We define $E_{\mathbf{p}}$ by

$$E_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathfrak{v}, v') = \bigoplus_a E_a(\Sigma^+, v)$$

using the isomorphism (21). The section (Kuranishi map) $s_{\mathbf{p}}$ is defined by

$$s_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathfrak{v}, v') = \bar{\partial}v' \in E_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathfrak{v}, v').$$

They are $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ equivariant by construction.

Let $s_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathfrak{v}, v') = 0$. Then $v' : (\Sigma^+(\mathfrak{v}), \partial\Sigma^+(\mathfrak{v})) \rightarrow (M, L)$ is pseudo-holomorphic. We forget added marked point and obtain $\bar{v}' : (\Sigma(\mathfrak{v}), \partial\Sigma(\mathfrak{v})) \rightarrow (M, L)$. We put

$$\psi_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathfrak{v}, v') = (\Sigma(\mathfrak{v}), \bar{v}') \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell, k}(\beta).$$

We thus described a construction of Kuranishi neighborhood for each given choice of $E_a(\Sigma^+, v)$, $\text{mkadd}(\Sigma^+)$. We next review how to glue them.

For each element $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta)$ we fix $E_{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\text{mkadd}(\mathbf{p})$. We write them as $E_{\mathbf{p}}^0$ and $\text{mkadd}^0(\mathbf{p})$ since later we will change them. We also take sufficiently small ϵ depending on $\mathbf{p}$ and construct a (tentative) Kuranishi neighborhood, which we denote by $(V_{\mathbf{p}}^0, E_{\mathbf{p}}^0, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}^0, s_{\mathbf{p}}^0, \psi_{\mathbf{p}}^0)$. We consider the covering

$$\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{p}} \psi_{\mathbf{p}}^0((s_{\mathbf{p}}^0)^{-1}(0))/\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}^0.$$

We now take a finite set $\mathbf{p}_a$, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{A}$ and closed subset $W(\mathbf{p}_a)$ of $\psi_{\mathbf{p}_a}^0((s_{\mathbf{p}_a}^0)^{-1}(0))/\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}_a}^0$ such that

$$\bigcup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{A}} \text{Int } W(\mathbf{p}_a) = \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J).$$

Now for each $\mathbf{p} = (\Sigma, v) \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J)$ we choose $E_{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\text{mkadd}(\mathbf{p})$ as follows. We put

$$\mathfrak{A}(\mathbf{p}) = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{A} \mid \mathbf{p} \in W(\mathbf{p}_a)\}.$$

then

$$(26) \quad \text{mkadd}(\mathbf{p}) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathbf{p})} \text{mkadd}^0(\mathbf{p}_a)$$

and

$$(27) \quad E_{\mathbf{p}} = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathbf{p})} E_{\mathbf{p}_a}^0.$$

We remark that we may regard $\text{mkadd}^0(\mathbf{p}_a) \subset \Sigma$, and $E_{\mathbf{p}}^0 \subset L^p(\Sigma, v^*TM \otimes \Lambda^{01})$ by using $\psi_{\mathbf{p}_a}$. We can use them to define Kuranishi neighborhood $(V_{\mathbf{p}}, E_{\mathbf{p}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}, s_{\mathbf{p}}, \psi_{\mathbf{p}})$ of each point in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J)$.

Using the closed-ness of the set $W(\mathbf{p}_a)$ we can prove that if $\mathbf{q} \in \psi_{\mathbf{p}}((s_{\mathbf{p}})^{-1}(0))/\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ then $E_{\mathbf{q}} \subseteq E_{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\text{mkadd}^0(\mathbf{q}) \subseteq \text{mkadd}^0(\mathbf{p})$. We can use it to construct coordinate change and then obtain Kuranishi structure.

We remark that here we construct Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J)$ for each of ℓ, k, β individually. We actually need to construct them so that they are related to each other at their boundaries. In next section we will do it, in a way slightly different from [13]. Namely in [13] the constructions are not compatible with forgetful map. We will modify it so that it is compatible with the forgetful map of boundary marked points. For this purpose we include $k = 0$ (the case of no boundary marked points.) This is the technical heart of the whole construction of this paper.

We will use the following notions in the next section.

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Kuranishi space and N be a smooth manifold. A *strongly continuous smooth map* $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N$ is a family $f = \{f_{\mathbf{p}}\}$ of $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ equivariant smooth maps $f_{\mathbf{p}} : V_{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow N$ which induces $f_{\mathbf{p}} : V_{\mathbf{p}}/\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow N$ and such that $f_{\mathbf{p}} \circ \overline{\varphi}_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}} = f_{\mathbf{q}}$ on $V_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}}/\Gamma_{\mathbf{q}}$.

We say the $\{f_{\mathbf{p}}\}$ is *weakly submersive* if each of $f_{\mathbf{p}}$ is a submersion.

In case Kuranishi space has boundary or corner, for the map to be submersive, we require that the restriction to each stratum is submersive.

We consider the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\alpha; J)$. The evaluation at marked points induces maps

$$\begin{aligned} ev &= (ev^{\text{int}}, ev) = ((ev_1^{\text{int}}, \dots, ev_{\ell}^{\text{int}}), (ev_0, \dots, ev_{k-1})) : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta) \rightarrow M^{\ell} \times L^k, \\ ev &= ev^{\text{int}} = (ev_1^{\text{int}}, \dots, ev_{\ell}^{\text{int}}) : \mathcal{M}_{\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta}) \rightarrow M^{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

These maps are strongly continuous. In [13] the Kuranishi structure is chosen so that they are weakly submersive. In the next section we do *not* choose so. We will explain the reason in Remark 3.2.

We next review fiber product of Kuranishi structures. Let $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ be Kuranishi spaces and $f = \{f_{\mathbf{p}}\}, g = \{g_{\mathbf{p}'}\}$ be strongly continuous maps from them to a manifold N . We consider

$$(28) \quad \mathcal{M}_1 \times_f \mathcal{M}_2 = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \mid f(x) = g(y)\}.$$

Lemma 2.1. *If either f or g are weakly submersive then the fiber product (28) has a Kuranishi structure.*

See [13] Section A1.3 for its proof. Let $h = \{h_{\mathbf{p}'}\} : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow N'$ be another strongly continuous map. It induces a strongly continuous map

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{M}_1 \times_f \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow N'$$

in an obvious way.

Lemma 2.2. *If f and h are weakly submersive then the map (29) is also weakly submersive.*

The proof is immediate from the corresponding statement for the submersion of smooth maps between manifolds and from the construction of fiber product in [13].

3. FORGETFULMAP COMPATIBLE KURANISHI STRUCTURE

Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold and L its Lagrangian submanifold. For $\beta \in H_2(M, L; \mathbb{Z})$, we defined the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta)$ as in Section 2. In Section 2, we wrote $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta; L; J)$ or $\mathcal{M}_{\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\alpha; J)$. Hereafter we omit J from notation when no confusion can occur.

We include the case $k = 0$. In that case we compactify it by adding $\mathcal{M}_{1+\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta}) \times L$ if $\partial\beta = 0$ as is explained in [13] Subsection 7.4.1. Namely we have an embedding

$$(30) \quad \text{clop} : \mathcal{M}_{1+\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})_{ev_0^{\text{int}}} \times_M L \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta).$$

Note $\mathcal{M}_{1+\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})$ is a moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic map from genus 0 stable map (without boundary). Here $\tilde{\beta} \in H_2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ is a class which goes to the class β by the natural homomorphism $H_2(X; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(X, L; \mathbb{Z})$. We fix compatible system of Kuranishi structures on them so that evaluation maps are submersion. And we will not change them.

We have a forgetful map

$$(31) \quad \text{forget} : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta).$$

We also consider the embedding

$$(32) \quad \text{glue} : \mathcal{M}_{\ell_1,1}(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_{\ell_2,1}(\beta_2) \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1+\ell_2,0}(\beta_1 + \beta_2).$$

Definition 3.1. Kuranishi structures of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$ and of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ are said to be *forgetfulmap compatible* to each other if the following holds.

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = [(\Sigma, z_0, \bar{z}^{\text{int}}), u] \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$ and $\mathbf{p} = \text{forget}([(\Sigma, z_0, \bar{z}^{\text{int}}), u]) = [(\Sigma, \bar{z}^{\text{int}}), u] \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. We first consider the case when $\mathbf{p}$ is not in the image of (30).

Let $(V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, \Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, \psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, s_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}})$ and $(V_{\mathbf{p}}, E_{\mathbf{p}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}, \psi_{\mathbf{p}}, s_{\mathbf{p}})$ be a Kuranishi neighborhoods of them, respectively. Then:

- (1) $V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} = V_{\mathbf{p}} \times (0, 1)$.
- (2) $E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} = E_{\mathbf{p}} \times (0, 1)$.
- (3) $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} = \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$. The action of $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ preserves identifications given in 1 and 2, where the action to the factor $(0, 1)$ is trivial.
- (4) $s_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}(x, t) = (s_{\mathbf{p}}(x), t)$ by the identification given in 1 and 2.
- (5) $\text{forget} \circ \psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ coincides with the composition of $\psi_{\mathbf{p}}$ and the projection to the first factor.

We next consider the case when $\mathbf{p}$ is in the image of (30). This implies that on the disc component Σ_0 containing z_0 , u is a constant map, and that Σ_0 has exactly one singular point and has no interior or boundary marked points other than z_0 . Let $\bar{\Sigma}$ be a closed semistable curve of genus 0 without boundary, which is obtained by removing Σ_0 from Σ . Let z_0^{int} be the point $\bar{\Sigma} \cap \Sigma_0 \subset \bar{\Sigma}$. We put $\bar{z}_+^{\text{int}} = (z_0^{\text{int}}, \bar{z}^{\text{int}})$. Then $((\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{z}_+^{\text{int}}, u), u(z_0^{\text{int}}))$ is an element of $\mathcal{M}_{1+\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta}) \times L$ such that

$$\text{clop}((\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{z}_+^{\text{int}}, u), u(z_0^{\text{int}})) = \mathbf{p}.$$

Let $(V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, \Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, \psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, s_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}})$ be a Kuranishi neighborhood of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$.

Let $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = [(\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{z}_+^{\text{int}}, u)]$ and $(V_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}, E_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}, \Gamma_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}, \psi_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}, s_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}})$ be its Kuranishi neighborhood in $\mathcal{M}_{1+\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})$. Since $ev_0^{\text{int}} : \mathcal{M}_{1+\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta}) \rightarrow M$ is strongly continuous and weakly submersive, it induces a submersion $ev_0^{\text{int}} : V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \rightarrow M$. Let $V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \cap L = (ev_0^{\text{int}})^{-1}(L) \subset V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$. The fiber product Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{1+\ell}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})|_{ev_0^{\text{int}}} \times_M L$ is $(V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \cap L, E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \cap L, \Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, \psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}, s_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}})$. (Here we write $E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \cap L$ for the restriction of $E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ to $V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \cap L$ by abuse of notation. We also write $s_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ or $\psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ for its appropriate restriction.)

- (1) $V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} = (V_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \cap L) \times [0, 1)$.
- (2) $E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} = E_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} \cap L \times (0, 1)$.
- (3) $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} = \Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$. The action of $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ preserves identifications given in 1 and 2, where the action to the factor $(0, 1)$ is trivial.
- (4) $s_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}(x, t) = (s_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}(x), t)$ by the identification given in 1 and 2.
- (5) $\text{forget} \circ \psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ coincides with the composition of $\psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}}$ and the projection to the first factor.

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 3.1. *There exists a system of Kuranishi structures on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$, such that:*

- (1) *They are forgetfulmap compatible in the sense of Definition 3.1.*
- (2) *$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta) \rightarrow L$ is strongly submersive.*
- (3) *They are compatible with (32). Namely the fiber product Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1,1}(\beta_1)|_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_{\ell_2,1}(\beta_2)$ (which is well-defined by 2) coincides with the pull back of the $\partial\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1+\ell_2,0}(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$ by glue.*
- (4) *They are component-wise in the sense of Definition 2.3.*

Proof. The most essential part of the proof is the following lemma. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = [(\Sigma, z_0, \tilde{z}^{\text{int}}), u] \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$ and $\mathbf{p} = \text{forget}[(\Sigma, z_0, \tilde{z}^{\text{int}}), u] = [(\Sigma, \tilde{z}^{\text{int}}), u] \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. We consider the case when $\mathbf{p}$ is not in the image of (30).

We consider the linearization of the pseudo-holomorphic curve equation (18). We consider the case $\Sigma = D^2$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any open subset U of $\text{Int } D^2$, there exists a finite dimensional linear subspace $E(u)$ of sections of $u^*TM \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}$ such that the following holds.*

- (1) *Each of elements of $E(u)$ is smooth and supported in U .*
- (2) *We put*

$$(33) \quad K(u) = (D_u \bar{\partial})^{-1}(E(u)).$$

Then for any $z_0 \in \partial D^2$ the map $Ev_{z_0} : K(u) \rightarrow T_{u(z_0)}L$ defined by

$$(34) \quad Ev_{z_0}(v) = v(z_0),$$

is surjective.

We remark that elements of $K(u)$ are smooth by elliptic regularity. Therefore (34) is well-defined.

Proof. For each fixed z_0 we can find $E(u; z_0)$ satisfying 1 and such that for $K(u; z_0) = (D_u \bar{\partial})^{-1}(E(u; z_0))$ the map $Ev_{z_0; z_0} : K(u; z_0) \rightarrow T_{u(z_0)}L$ defined by (34) is surjective. (This is a consequence of unique continuation. See [13].)

Then there exists a neighborhood $W(z_0)$ of z_0 in ∂D^2 such that if $z \in W(z_0)$ then the map $Ev_{z_0; z} : K(u; z_0) \rightarrow T_{u(z)}L$ defined by $Ev_{z_0; z}(v) = v(z)$ is a submersion. We cover ∂D^2 by finitely many $W(z_0)$ say $W(z_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then $E(u) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^N E(u; z_i)$ has the required property. $\square$

We next consider the case of the boundary point corresponding to $\mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})_{ev_1^{\text{int}}} \times_M L$. For this purpose, we need to take Kuranishi structure on the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic sphere.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a system of Kuranishi structures on $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$ for various $\ell \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in \pi_2(M)$ with the following properties.*

- (1) *The action of permutation group of order $\ell!$ on $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$ exchanging marked points is extended to an action of the Kuranishi structures.*
- (2) *The evaluation map $ev^{\text{int}} : \mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha) \rightarrow M^\ell$ is strongly continuous and weakly submersive.*
- (3) *Let $\ell_1 + \ell_2 = \ell + 2$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$. Then by the embedding*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1}^{\text{cl}}(\alpha_1)_{ev_1^{\text{int}}} \times_{ev_1^{\text{int}}} \mathcal{M}_{\ell_2}^{\text{cl}}(\alpha_2) \subset \mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$$

the Kuranishi structure in the right hand side restricts to the fiber product Kuranishi structure in the left hand side. In particular, our Kuranishi structures are component-wise.

This is proved in [16].

We now consider the boundary point $(v, x) \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})_{ev_1^{\text{int}}} \times_M L$, where $v \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})$ and $x = ev_1^{\text{int}}(v) \in L$. Let (V, Γ, E, s, ψ) be a Kuranishi neighborhood of v we have taken in Lemma 3.2. We take

$$V' = (ev_1^{\text{int}})^{-1}(L).$$

This is smooth and $ev : V' \rightarrow L$, (which is the restriction of ev^{int} to V' is a submersion. Therefore we take $(V', \Gamma, E|_{V'}, s|_{V'}, \psi|_{(s|_{V'})^{-1}(0)/\Gamma})$ can be regarded as the Kuranishi neighborhood of (v, x) in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})_{ev_1^{\text{int}}} \times_M L$. We put

$$\text{Conf}^o(k; (\partial D^2, 0)) = \{(z_1, \dots, z_k) \in (\partial D^2)^k \mid z_i \text{ respects cyclic order}\}/S^1$$

and let $\text{Conf}(k; (\partial D^2, 0))$ be its compactification. Then

$$\text{Conf}(k; (\partial D^2, 0)) \times V'$$

can be regarded as a stratum of a Kuranishi neighborhood of the pull back of (v, x) in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})$. We can extend it to a Kuranishi neighborhood of (v, x) . Then the properties 1,2 of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied.

We thus described a way to obtain a space $E(u)$ satisfying the properties 1,2 of Lemma 3.1 at each point of the compactification of $\mathcal{M}_1(\beta)$.

Now we are in the position to complete the proof of Theorem 3.1. The proof is by induction on $\beta \cap \omega$. We assume that we have chosen already the Kuranishi structure satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 for β' with $\beta' \cap \omega < \beta \cap \omega$.

We consider $\mathcal{M}_0(\beta)$. A component of its boundary is

$$\mathcal{M}_1(\beta_1) \times_L \mathcal{M}_1(\beta_2)$$

with $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$. We already fixed a Kuranishi structure on each of the factors. We take the fiber product Kuranishi structure on it. We then lift it to a Kuranishi structure of a boundary component of $\mathcal{M}_1(\beta)$. We claim that ev_0 is weakly submersive for this Kuranishi structure. In fact the boundary component we are studying is one of the following three cases:

$$(35a) \quad \mathcal{M}_2(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_1(\beta_2)$$

where $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_1(\beta) \rightarrow L$ is the map ev_1 of the first factor.

$$(35b) \quad \mathcal{M}_1(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_2(\beta_2),$$

where $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_1(\beta) \rightarrow L$ is the map ev_1 of the second factor.

$$(35c) \quad \mathcal{M}_1(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_1(\beta_2),$$

where ev_0 is the map $((\Sigma_1, v_1), (\Sigma_2, v_2)) \mapsto ev_0(\Sigma_1, v_1) = ev_0(\Sigma_2, v_2)$.

We remark that (35c) is identified with

$$(\mathcal{M}_1(\beta_1) \times \mathcal{M}_1(\beta_2))_{(ev_0, ev_0)} \times_{(ev_1, ev_2)} \mathcal{M}_3(0).$$

Here 0 in $\mathcal{M}_3(0)$ is $0 \in H_2(M, L; \mathbb{Z})$.

We first consider the case (35a). By induction hypothesis

$$(ev_1, ev_0) : \mathcal{M}_2(\beta_1) \times \mathcal{M}_1(\beta_2) \rightarrow L^2$$

is weakly submersive. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that ev_0 is submersive on (35a). The case (35b), (35c) are similar.

In case $[\partial\beta] = 0$ there is another boundary component $\mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta}) \times_M L$ of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. We already explained the way to impose obstruction bundle and then Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta})$ so that the map ev_0 is weakly submersive. Therefore we can define a Kuranishi structure on a neighborhood of this boundary component of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ by extending fiber product Kuranishi structure. We thus constructed the required Kuranishi structure on a neighborhood of the boundary of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. Because of the inductive way to constructing our Kuranishi structures they are compatible at their intersections.

Now we can use Lemma 3.1 in the same way as [13] Section 7.2 to extend it the whole $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. We define Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$ by taking pull back of the Kuranishi structure of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ via forgetful map. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is now complete. $\square$

We consider the forgetful map

$$\text{forget}_{k+1,1} : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$$

forgetting 2nd, ..., $k+1$ -th marked points. Note we enumerate marked points as $z_0, \dots, z_k$. We forget $z_1, \dots, z_k$.

Corollary 3.1. *There exists a system of Kuranishi structures on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ $k \geq 0$, $\ell \geq 0$, with the following properties.*

- (1) *It is compatible with $\text{forget}_{k+1,1}$.*
- (2) *It is invariant under the cyclic permutation of the boundary marked points.*
- (3) *It is invariant of the permutation of interior marked points.*
- (4) *$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta) \rightarrow L$ is strongly submersive.*
- (5) *We consider the decomposition of the boundary:*

$$(36) \quad \partial \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq j+1 \leq k+1} \bigcup_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} \bigcup_{L_1 \cup L_2 = \{1, \dots, \ell\}} \mathcal{M}_{\#L_1, j-i+1}(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_i} \mathcal{M}_{\#L_2, k-j+i}(\beta_2).$$

(See [13] Subsection 7.1.1.) Then the restriction of the Kuranishi structure of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ in the left hand side coincides with the fiber product Kuranishi structure in the right hand side.

We first explain the statement.

1 is similar to the Definition 3.1. The only difference is we replace $(0, 1)$ appearing there with $(0, 1)^{k-m} \times [0, 1]^m$ for some appropriate m .

The cyclic permutation of boundary marked points is defined as follows. Let (Σ, v) be a point in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$. Let $z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k$ be boundary marked points of Σ . We change them to $z_1, \dots, z_k, z_0$ to obtain (Σ', v) . 2 claims that this action extends to the Kuranishi structure. (See [13] Subsection A1.3 for the definition of finite group action to Kuranishi structure.)

The meaning of 3 is similar. Here we consider not only cyclic permutation but also an arbitrary permutation of the interior marked points.

We remark that 4 and Lemma 28 imply that the right hand side of (36) has a Kuranishi structure. Then 5 claims that the boundary of the moduli space of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ as Kuranishi space decomposes as in the right hand side of (36). We remark that the i -th, ..., j -th boundary marked points of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ correspond to the 1-st, ..., $j-i+1$ -th marked points of the first factor and the other boundary marked points (except the 0-th) of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ correspond to the boundary marked points (except i -th) of the right hand side. Also the interior marked points correspond to each other in an obvious way. We then have a compatibility statement of evaluation maps in an obvious way. It is a part of the statement 5.

Note $k+1 \geq 1$. Therefore the extra boundary component $\mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\text{cl}}(\tilde{\beta}) \times_M L$ of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ does not appear in (36).

Proof. We already defined the Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$ in Theorem 3.1. We define the Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ so that 1 holds. (This determines the

Kuranishi structure uniquely.) Then, by Theorem 3.1.1, our Kuranishi structure of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ is pulled back from one on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. 2 follows immediately. 3 is a consequence of Theorem 3.1.4. 4 is a consequence of Theorem 3.1.2. 5 is a consequence of Theorem 3.1.3. $\square$

Remark 3.1. The Kuranishi structure we constructed is *not* compatible with the forgetful map of the *interior* marked points. The reason is rather technical. Namely we require the support of the obstruction bundle E_a to be disjoint from marked or singular points. This is automatic for the boundary marked points since we also assume that it is disjoint from the boundary. However if we try to imitate the proof of Theorem 3.1 to obtain a Kuranishi structure which is compatible with the forgetful map, this causes a problem. Namely if we construct Kuranishi structure of $\mathcal{M}_{0,0}(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{M}_0^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$ so that the evaluation map is submersive for the pull back Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$, then, a priori, we can not assume the support of obstruction bundle E_a to be disjoint from marked points. (In fact we need to fix E_a for elements of $\mathcal{M}_0^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$. So the interior marked point of the pull back Kuranishi structure $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$ can be arbitrary. Therefore, we can not exclude that it is in the support of E_a .)

The reason why the support of obstruction bundle E_a is assumed to be disjoint from singular point is as follows:

- (1) The glueing analysis is easier. If E_a hits the singular point we need to study the case when perturbation is put on the neck region also.
- (2) We need to identify obstruction bundle of the pieces Σ_a as a section of appropriate bundles after resolving singularity of $\cup \Sigma_a$. (See (21).) This is easier in case when the support of E_a is away from singular points.

We remark that we can not distinguish marked points from singular points when we want to make perturbation component-wise. This is the reason why it is assumed that the support of E_a is disjoint from marked points. However the description above also shows that by working harder we might remove this restriction and then can find a Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta)$ which is compatible with the forgetful map of the interior marked points also. Since we do not need it in this paper, we do not try to prove it here.

Remark 3.2. For the Kuranishi structure we constructed in Corollary 3.1, the evaluation map ev_0 is weakly submersive. As a consequence of cyclic symmetry it implies that ev_i is submersive for each but fixed i . On the other hand, in [13], we used a Kuranishi structure such that $(ev_0, \dots, ev_{k-1}) : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta) \rightarrow L^k$ is weakly submersive. We remark that there does not exist a system of Kuranishi structures such that $(ev_0, \dots, ev_{k-1})$ is weakly submersive and is compatible with the forgetful map in the sense of Corollary 3.1.1, at the same time. In fact if d is a dimension of the Kuranishi neighborhood $V_{\mathbf{p}}$ of a point in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$, then the dimension of the Kuranishi neighborhood $V_{\mathbf{p}}$ of compatible Kuranishi structure in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k}(\beta)$ is $k + d - 1$. (We remark that dimension here is one of the manifold $V_{\mathbf{p}}$. It is different from the dimension as the Kuranishi space.) If k is large then dimension of L^k , which is nk , is certainly bigger than $k + d - 1$. Therefore $(ev_0, \dots, ev_{k-1})$ can not be weakly submersive.

A key idea of the proof of Corollary 3.1 is the observation that the submersivity of ev_0 is enough to carry out the inductive construction. (This observation was due to [14].) We remark also that for this observation to hold the assumption, genus

$= 0$ is essential. Namely the same method does not work for its generalization to higher genus.

4. CONTINUOUS FAMILY OF MULTISECTIONS: REVIEW

In the next section we will construct perturbation of the Kuranishi map of the Kuranishi structure constructed in the last section so that it is compatible with the forgetful map of the boundary marked points and is cyclically symmetric (as its consequence). The author does not know how to do it using multi (but finitely many) valued sections. So we use continuous family of multisections. The notion of continuous family of multisections had already been used in [12] Section 33, [7], [15] etc.. We first review them in this section.

We first recall the notion of good coordinate system. Let $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$ be Kuranishi charts parametrized by $\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$. We assume that the index set $\mathfrak{A}$ has a partial order $<$, where either $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_1$ holds for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathfrak{A}$ if

$$\psi_{\alpha_1}(s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \cap \psi_{\alpha_2}(s_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Moreover we assume that if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ then there exists a coordinate transformation from $(V_{\alpha_1}, E_{\alpha_1}, \Gamma_{\alpha_1}, \psi_{\alpha_1}, s_{\alpha_1})$ to $(V_{\alpha_2}, E_{\alpha_2}, \Gamma_{\alpha_2}, \psi_{\alpha_2}, s_{\alpha_2})$, in the sense described in Section 2. We assume compatibility between coordinate transformations in the sense of [16], [13]. Existence of good coordinate system is proved in [16] Lemma 6.3.

We next review multisection. (See [16] section 3.) Let $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha)$ be a Kuranishi chart of $\mathcal{M}$. For $x \in V_\alpha$ we consider the fiber $E_{\alpha,x}$ of the bundle E_α at x . We take its l copies and consider the direct product $E_{\alpha,x}^l$. We divide it by the action of symmetric group of order $l!$ and let $\mathcal{S}^l(E_{\alpha,x})$ be the quotient space. There exists a map $tm_m : \mathcal{S}^l(E_{\alpha,x}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{lm}(E_{\alpha,x})$, which sends $[a_1, \dots, a_l]$ to $[\underbrace{a_1, \dots, a_1}_{m \text{ copies}}, \dots, \underbrace{a_l, \dots, a_l}_{m \text{ copies}}]$. A *multisection* s of the orbibundle $E_\alpha \rightarrow V_\alpha$ consists

of an open covering $\bigcup_i U_i = V_\alpha$ and s_i which sends $x \in U_i$ to $s_i(x) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha,x})$. They are required to have the following properties.

- (1) U_i is Γ_α invariant. s_i is Γ_α equivariant. (We remark that there exists an obvious map $\gamma : \mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha,x}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha,\gamma x})$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma_\alpha$.)
- (2) If $x \in U_i \cap U_j$ then we have $tm_{l_j}(s_i(x)) = tm_{l_i}(s_j(x)) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i l_j}(E_{\alpha,\gamma x})$.
- (3) s_i is *liftable and smooth* in the following sense. For each x there exists a smooth section $\tilde{s}_i$ of $\underbrace{E_\alpha \oplus \dots \oplus E_\alpha}_{l_i \text{ times}}$ in a neighborhood of x such that

$$(37) \quad \tilde{s}_i(y) = (s_{i,1}(y), \dots, s_{i,l_i}(y)), \quad s_i(y) = [s_{i,1}(y), \dots, s_{i,l_i}(y)].$$

We identify two multisections $(\{U_i\}, \{s_i\}, \{l_i\})$, $(\{U'_i\}, \{s'_i\}, \{l'_i\})$ if

$$tm_{l_j}(s_i(x)) = tm_{l'_j}(s'_j(x)) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i l'_j}(E_{\alpha,\gamma x}).$$

on $U_i \cap U'_j$. We say $s_{i,j}$ to be a *branch* of s_i in the situation of (37).

We next discuss continuous family of multisections and its transversality. Let W_α be a finite dimensional manifold and consider the pull-back bundle

$$\pi_\alpha^* E_\alpha \rightarrow V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$$

under $\pi_\alpha : V_\alpha \times W_\alpha \rightarrow V_\alpha$. The action of Γ_α on W_α is, by definition, trivial.

Definition 4.1. (1) A W_α parametrized family $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ of multisections is by definition a multisection of $\pi_\alpha^* E_\alpha$.

- (2) We fix a metric of our bundle E_α . We say $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is ϵ close to s_α in C^0 topology if the following holds. Let $(x, w) \in V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$. Then for any branch $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, i, j}$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ we have

$$\text{dist}(\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, i, j}(w, y), s_\alpha(y)) < \epsilon$$

if y is in a neighborhood of x .

- (3) $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is said to be transversal to 0 if the following holds : Let $(x, w) \in V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$. Then any branch $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, i, j}$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is transversal to 0.
- (4) Let $f_\alpha : V_\alpha \rightarrow M$ be a Γ_α equivariant smooth map. We assume that $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is transversal to 0. We then say that $f_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion if the following holds. Let $(x, w) \in V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$. Then for any branch $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, i, j}$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ the restriction of $f_\alpha \circ \pi_\alpha : V_\alpha \times W_\alpha \rightarrow M$ to

$$(38) \quad \{(x, w) \mid \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, i, j}(x, w) = 0\}$$

is a submersion. We remark that (38) is a smooth manifold by 3.

Remark 4.1. In case $\mathcal{M}$ has boundary or corner, (38) has boundary or corner. In this case we require that the restriction of f_α to each of the stratum of (38) is a submersion.

Lemma 4.1. *We assume that $f_\alpha : V_\alpha \rightarrow M$ is a submersion. Then there exists W_α such that for any ϵ there exists a W_α parametrized family $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ of multisections which is ϵ close to s_α , transversal to 0 and such that $f_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion.*

Moreover there exists $0 \in W_\alpha$ such that the restriction of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ to $V_\alpha \times \{0\}$ coincides with s_α .

If $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is already given and satisfies the required condition on a neighborhood of a compact set K_α , then we may extend it to the whole W_α without changing it on K_α .

We omit the proof. See [15]. We next describe the compatibility conditions among the W_α -parametrized families of multisections for various α . During the construction we need to shrink V_α a bit several times. We do not mention it explicitly below.

Let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. We consider the normal bundle $N_{\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})}V_{\alpha_2}$ of the embedding $\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1} : V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \rightarrow V_{\alpha_2}$. We take a small neighborhood $U_\epsilon(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}))$ of its image and identify it with an ϵ -neighborhood $B_\epsilon N_{\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})}V_{\alpha_2}$ of the zero section $\cong V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$ of $N_{\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})}V_{\alpha_2}$. We then have a projection $\text{Pr} : U_\epsilon(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})) \rightarrow V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$.

We pull back the bundle $E_{\alpha_1}|_{V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}}$ by Pr to obtain $\text{Pr}^*E_{\alpha_1} \rightarrow V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$. We extend the bundle embedding $\hat{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1} : E_{\alpha_1}|_{V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}} \rightarrow E_{\alpha_2}$ to a bundle embedding:

$$\hat{\phi}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1} : \text{Pr}^*E_{\alpha_1} \rightarrow E_{\alpha_2}|_{U_\epsilon(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}))}.$$

We consider the section (Kuranishi map) $s_{\alpha_2} : U_\epsilon(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})) \rightarrow E_{\alpha_2}$ and compose it with the projection to obtain:

$$(39) \quad \pi \circ s_{\alpha_2} : U_\epsilon(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})) \rightarrow \frac{E_{\alpha_2}}{\text{Pr}^*E_{\alpha_1}}.$$

We remark that (39) is zero on the zero section $= \phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})$ and the fiber derivative of it there induces an isomorphism.

Let $\text{Exp} : B_\epsilon N_{\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})} V_{\alpha_2} \rightarrow U_\epsilon(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}))$ be the isomorphism we mentioned above. By modifying it using fiber-wise diffeomorphism we may assume that

$$(40) \quad \pi \circ s_{\alpha_2} \circ \text{Exp} : B_\epsilon N_{\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})} V_{\alpha_2} \rightarrow \frac{E_{\alpha_2}}{\text{Pr}^* E_{\alpha_1}}$$

is a restriction of (linear) isomorphism of vector bundles.

Now let $U_{i,\alpha_1} \subset V_{\alpha_1}$ and $\{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ be a multisection on $U_{i,\alpha_1} \times W_{\alpha_1}$. We take W_{α_2,α_1} and put $W_{\alpha_2} = W_{\alpha_1} \times W_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$. We define

$$\text{Pr}^{-1}(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})) = U_{i,\alpha_2} \subset U_\epsilon(\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})).$$

Definition 4.2. W_{α_2} parametrized family of multisections $\{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ on U_{i,α_2} is said to be *compatible* with $\{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ if the following holds.

$\{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ is a multisection of E_{α_2} on $U_{i,\alpha_2} \times W_{\alpha_2}$.

Let $y = \text{Exp}(x, \xi)$ with $x \in U_{i,\alpha_1} \cap U_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2}$, $\xi \in (N_{\phi_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})} V_{\alpha_2})_x$ ($\|\xi\| < \epsilon$) and $w = (w_1, w_2) \in W_{\alpha_2} = W_{\alpha_1} \times W_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$. Then, we have:

$$(41) \quad \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2,i,j}(y, w) \equiv (\pi \circ s_{\alpha_2})(y) \pmod{\text{Pr}^* E_{\alpha_1}}.$$

We assume also that

$$(42) \quad \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2,i,j}(\text{Exp}(x, 0), w) = \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1,i,j}(x, w_1).$$

We remark that for given $\{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ we can always find $\{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ which is compatible to it. In fact we can use the splitting

$$E_{\alpha_2} = \text{Pr}^* E_{\alpha_1} \oplus \frac{E_{\alpha_2}}{\text{Pr}^* E_{\alpha_1}}$$

to construct it.

Moreover if $f = \{f_\alpha\} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N$ is strongly continuous and weakly submersive map and $f_{\alpha_1}|_{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion, then $f_{\alpha_2}|_{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion, for small ϵ .

Thus we can prove the following by induction of α with respect to the order $<$ and by using Lemma 4.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Kuranishi space with a good coordinate system $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, \mathfrak{s}_\alpha)$ ($\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$). Let $f = \{f_\alpha\} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N$ be a strongly continuous and weakly submersive map. Then there exists a system of continuous family of multisections $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha = \{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ of E_α such that:*

- (1) *They are compatible in the sense of Definition 4.2.*
- (2) *They are transversal to 0 in the sense of Definition 4.1.3.*
- (3) *$f_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion in the sense of Definition 4.1.4.*
- (4) *They are C^0 close to the original Kuranishi map in the sense of Definition 4.1.2.*

Remark 4.2. We can prove a relative version of Proposition 4.1. Namely if there exists an open set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ and a compact set $K \subset \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ satisfying 1, 2, 3, 4 above are given on $\mathcal{U}$, then we can extend it with required properties, without changing it on K .

We next review the way to use family of multisections to define smooth correspondence.

We work on the following situation. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Kuranishi space, $f^s = \{f_\alpha^s\} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N_s$ a strongly continuous map and $f^t = \{f_\alpha^t\} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N_t$ a strongly continuous

and weakly submersive map. Here N_s, N_t are smooth manifolds. (Here s and t stand for source and target, respectively.) Let $\Lambda^d(M)$ denote the set of smooth d forms on M . We will define

$$(43) \quad \text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t) : \Lambda^d(N_s) \rightarrow \Lambda^\ell(N_t)$$

where $\ell = d + \dim N_t - \dim \mathcal{M}$.

We first take a continuous family of multisections $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha = \{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j} \mid j = 1, \dots, l_i\}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ such that $f_\alpha^t|_{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion. Let $\rho \in \Lambda^d(N_s)$. We consider a representative $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ it is a section of E_α on $U_{i,\alpha} \times W_\alpha$. We take a top dimensional smooth form ω_α on W_α of compact support such that its total mass is 1. Let χ_i be a partition of unity subordinate to the covering $\{U_{i,\alpha}\}$. We consider

$$(44) \quad \sum_i f_\alpha^t \frac{1}{l_i} \chi_i ((f_\alpha^s)^* \rho \wedge \omega_\alpha)|_{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}}.$$

Here l_i is the number of branches and f_α^t are integration along fiber. This defines ‘ U_α part’ of $\text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t)$. We use partition of unity again to glue them for various α to obtain a map (43). See [15] for detail.

Remark 4.3. The map (43) depends on the choice of multisection $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ and the smooth form ω_α . But it is independent of the choice of partition of unity.

The smooth correspondence we defined above has the following two properties.

Proposition 4.2 (Stokes). *We have*

$$(45) \quad d \circ \text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t) - \text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t) \circ d = \text{Corr}_*(\partial \mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t).$$

Proof. On each chart this is a consequence of Stokes’ theorem. By using partition of unity in a standard way we obtain the proposition. $\square$

To state the next proposition, we need some notation. We consider oriented Kuranishi spaces $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$. Let $f^{1,s} : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow N_s^1$, $f^{2,s} : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow N_t^1 \times N_s^2$ be strongly continuous maps and $f^{1,t} : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow N_t^1$, $f^{2,t} : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow N_t^2$ be strongly continuous and weakly submersive maps. We put

$$(46) \quad \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times_{f^{1,t} \times f^{2,t}} \mathcal{M}_2$$

where we use the second factor $\mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow N_t^1$ of the map $f^{2,s}$ to define the above fiber product. $f^{1,s}$ and $f^{2,s}$ induces a strongly continuous map $f^s : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N_s^1 \times N_s^2$. $f^{2,t}$ induces a strongly continuous and weakly submersive map $f^t : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N_t^2$. (Lemma 2.1.)

Proposition 4.3 (Composition formula). *If $\rho_i \in \Lambda(N_i^2)$ ($i = 1, 2$) then we have*

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t)(\rho_1 \times \rho_2) \\ &= \text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}_2; f^{2,s}, f^{2,t})(\text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}_1; f^{1,s}, f^{1,t})(\rho_1) \times \rho_2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. On each chart this is obvious. So we can use partition of unity in a standard way to prove the propositions. $\square$

Remark 4.4. We need to take and fix appropriate orientation in Propositions 4.2, 4.3. We will do it later but only in case we use. See the end of Section 7.

We also remark the next lemma. Let $(\mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t)$ be as above. Here $f^t : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow N_t$ is weakly submersive. We consider $(\mathcal{M}; f^s \times f^t, \text{const})$ where $\text{const} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \{\text{point}\}$ is a constant map to a point.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\rho_s \in \Lambda(N_s)$ and $\rho_t \in \Lambda(N_t)$. Then*

$$(48) \quad \int_{N_t} \text{Corr}(\mathcal{M}; f^s, f^t)(\rho_s) \wedge \rho_t = \text{Corr}(\mathcal{M}; f^s \times f^t, \text{const})(\rho_s \wedge \rho_t).$$

Note the right hand side is an element of $\Lambda(\{\text{point}\}) = \mathbb{R}$.

5. FORGETFULMAP COMPATIBLE CONTINUOUS FAMILY OF MULTISECTIONS

In this section, we define a system of continuous family of multisections on the Kuranishi space produced in Section 3. We will construct the system so that it is compatible with forgetful maps.

We first define this compatibility precisely. We consider the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$, $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ and consider their Kuranishi structures which are compatible in the sense of Definition 3.1. We take their good coordinate systems which are compatible in a similar sense. More precise definition of this compatibility is in order. We have Kuranishi charts $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha)$ ($\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$) of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ and $(V_{\tilde{\alpha}}, E_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \psi_{\tilde{\alpha}}, s_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \Gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}})$ ($\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$) of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$. Here $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$ are partially ordered sets. We require that there exists an order preserving map $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$, $\tilde{\alpha} \mapsto \alpha$ such that:

- (1) $V_{\tilde{\alpha}} = V_\alpha \times (0, 1)$.
- (2) $E_{\tilde{\alpha}} = E_\alpha \times (0, 1)$.
- (3) $\Gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \Gamma_\alpha$. The action of $\Gamma_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ preserves identifications given in 1 and 2, where the action to the factor $(0, 1)$ is trivial.
- (4) $s_{\tilde{\alpha}}(x, t) = (s_\alpha(x), t)$ by the identification given in 1 and 2.
- (5) $\text{forget} \circ \psi_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ coincides with the composition of ψ_α and the projection to the first factor.

Definition 5.1. Let $U_{\alpha,i}$, W_α . $\{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}\}$ define a compatible system of family of multisections on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ and $U_{\tilde{\alpha},i}$, $W_{\tilde{\alpha}}$. $\{\mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha},i,j}\}$ define a compatible system of family of multisections on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$.

We say that they are *compatible* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $U_{\tilde{\alpha},i} = U_{\alpha,i} \times (0, 1)$.
- (2) $W_{\tilde{\alpha}} = W_\alpha$.
- (3) $\mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha},i,j}(w, x, t) = \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}(w, (x, t))$.

The main result of this section is as follows:

Theorem 5.1. *For each $E_0 > 0$, $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compatible systems of families of multisections $(U_{\tilde{\alpha},i}, W_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \{\mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha},i,j}\})$, $(U_{\alpha,i}, W_\alpha, \{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}\})$ on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta)$, $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ for $\beta \cap \omega \leq E_0$ and $\ell \leq \ell_0$, with the following properties:*

- (1) *They are ϵ close to the Kuranishi map.*
- (2) *They are compatible in the sense of Definition 5.1.*
- (3) *They are transversal to 0 in the sense of Definition 4.1.3.*
- (4) *$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,1}(\beta) \rightarrow L$ induces submersions $(ev_0)_{\tilde{\alpha}}|_{\mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{-1}(0)} : \mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{-1}(0) \rightarrow L$.*
- (5) *They are compatible with (32) in the sense we describe below.*

We describe the above Condition 5 precisely below. We consider U_{α_1,i_1} , $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1,i_1,j_1}$ of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1,1}(\beta_1)$ and U_{α_2,i_2} , $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2,i_2,j_2}$ of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell_2,1}(\beta_2)$. We put $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. The fiber product

$$(49) \quad V_\alpha := V_{\alpha_1} \times_{ev_0} V_{\alpha_2}$$

is a Kuranishi neighborhood of the Kuranishi space

$$\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1,1}(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_{\ell_2,1}(\beta_2).$$

(49) contains a fiber product $U_{\alpha,(i_1,i_2)} = U_{\alpha_1,i_1}{}_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} U_{\alpha_2,i_2}$. An obstruction bundle on (49) is a restriction of $E_{\alpha_1} \times E_{\alpha_2}$. We put $W_\alpha = W_{\alpha_1} \times W_{\alpha_2}$. Now we define

$$(50) \quad \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,(i_1,i_2),(j_1,j_2)} = (\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1,i_1,j_1}, \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2,i_2,j_2})|_{U_{\alpha,(i_1,i_2)}}.$$

(50) defines a compatible system of continuous family of multisections on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1,1}(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_{\ell_2,1}(\beta_2)$. Condition 5 requires that this system coincides with the restriction of one in $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. Here $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2$, $\ell = \ell_1 + \ell_2$.

Proof. The strategy of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1. We first consider the situation of Lemma 3.1 and use the notations there.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $V_0 \subset \overline{V}_0 \subset V_1 \subset \overline{V}_1 \subset V$ be neighborhoods of u in V_α , where V_α is a Kuranishi neighborhood of u .*

Then there exists a finite dimensional vector space $W(u)$ and a section $s_u : V \times W(u) \rightarrow E(u) \times W(u)$ with the following properties.

- (1) $s_u(v, 0) = D_v \overline{\partial}$.
- (2) $s_u(v, w) = D_v \overline{\partial}$ if $v \notin V_1$.
- (3) If $D_v \overline{\partial} = 0$ and $v \in V_0$ then the map

$$D_{(v,0)} s_u : T_v V \times T_0 W(u) \rightarrow E(u)$$

is surjective.

- (4) If v is as in 3 and if $z_0 \in \partial D^2$, then

$$D_{(v,0)} s_u \oplus d_{v,0} E v_{z_0} : T_v V \times T_0 W(u) \rightarrow E(u) \oplus T_{v(z_0)} L$$

is surjective.

Proof. Let $\chi : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on V_0 and $\chi \equiv 0$ on the complement of V_1 . We put $W(u) = E(u)$ and

$$s_u(v, w) = D_v \overline{\partial} + \chi(v)w.$$

The lemma then follows easily from (34). $\square$

We consider a Kuranishi chart V_α of $\mathcal{M}_0(\beta)$. For simplicity of notation, we assume that each element of V_α is represented by a map from a disc (without singular point). Let $u \in V_\alpha$. We apply Lemma 5.1 and obtain V_0, V_1, V , which we denote by $V_0(u), V_1(u), V(u)$. We also have $E(u)$ and obtain $s_u, W(u)$. (We remark that $E(u)$ here is the restriction of E_α , the obstruction bundle of our Kuranishi chart.) Let $\Gamma(u) \subset \Gamma_\alpha$ be the isotropy group of u . We may assume that $U(u) \cap \gamma V(u) \neq \emptyset$, $\gamma \in \Gamma_\alpha$ implies that $\gamma \in \Gamma(u)$ and that $V_0(u), V_1(u), V_2(u)$ are $\Gamma(u)$ invariant. (We do not (and can not) require s_u to be $\Gamma(u)$ equivariant.)

We take Γ_α invariant relatively compact subset $V'_\alpha \subset V_\alpha$ such that V'_α/Γ_α still cover $\mathcal{M}_0(\beta)$. V'_α/Γ_α is covered by finitely many of $V_0(u)/\Gamma(u)$'s, which we write $V_0(u_c)/\Gamma(u_c)$, $c = 1, \dots, N$. We put

$$W_\alpha = W(u_1) \times \dots \times W(u_N).$$

For each c , the map s_{u_c} determines a multisection on V_α/Γ_α which coincides with s_α outside $V_1(u_c)/\Gamma(u_c)$. (Lemma 5.1.2.) We denote it by s_{u_c} by abuse of notation.

Let $\chi_c : V_\alpha/\Gamma(u_c) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a partition of unity subordinate to the covering $\{V_1(u_c)/\Gamma(u_c) \mid c = 1, \dots, N\}$. We now put

$$(51) \quad \mathfrak{s}_\alpha(v; w_1, \dots, w_I) = s_\alpha(v) + \sum_i \chi_c(v) (s_c(v, w) - s_\alpha(v)).$$

(See [16] Definition 3.4 for the sum of multisections, which appear in the right hand side of (51).) Now we have:

Lemma 5.2. *There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that the following holds.*

- (1) $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is transversal to 0.
- (2) We take $U_i \subset V'_\alpha/\Gamma_\alpha$ such that $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ has a representative $(\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j})_{j=1}^{l_j}$ on $U_i \times W$. We put

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0) = \{(v, w) \in U_i \times W \mid \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}(v, w) = 0, \|w\| \leq \epsilon\}.$$

This is a manifold by 1. Then for each $z_0 \in \partial D^2$ the map

$$Ev_{z_0} : \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0) \rightarrow L$$

defined by $(v, w) \mapsto Ev_{z_0}(v, w) = v(z_0)$, is a submersion.

- (3) $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}(v, 0) = s_\alpha(v)$.

Proof. 1,2,3 follows from Lemma 5.1 3,4,1 respectively. $\square$

Lemma 5.2 enables us to construct a family of multisections required in Theorem 5.1 locally. We can prove the relative version of Lemma 5.2 also in the same way.

Remark 5.1. We remark that we can use Lemma 5.2.3 to prove the property 1 in Theorem 5.1. Namely we can shrink W to its small neighborhood of 0. Then Lemma 5.2.3 implies that $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}$ is C^0 close to the Kuranishi map s_α .

We next state the analog of Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 5.3. *For each E_0 and ℓ_0 , there exists a system of continuous family of multisections on various $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$ for various $\ell \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in \pi_2(M)$ with $\alpha \cap \omega \leq E_0$ and $\ell \leq \ell_0$. It has the following properties.*

- (1) The action of permutation group of order $\ell!$ on $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$ exchanging marked points preserves the family of multisections.
- (2) It is transversal to 0.
- (3) The evaluation map $ev^{\text{int}} : \mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha) \rightarrow M^\ell$ is a submersion on the zero set.
- (4) Let $\ell_1 + \ell_2 = \ell + 2$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$. Then the embedding

$$\mathcal{M}_{\ell_1}^{\text{cl}}(\alpha_1)_{ev_1^{\text{int}}} \times_{ev_1^{\text{int}}} \mathcal{M}_{\ell_2}^{\text{cl}}(\alpha_2) \subset \mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$$

is compatible with our system of continuous families of multisections.

Proof. The proof is by induction on (α, ℓ) . We can organize the order of the induction in the same way as [13] Section 7.2. 4 determines the family of multisections in the singular locus of each of $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$. By 2,3 of the fiber product factors, we can prove that 2,3 are satisfied on the singular locus. We can then use the argument of the last section to extend it to $\mathcal{M}_\ell^{\text{cl}}(\alpha)$. $\square$

Note we do not require compatibility with forgetful map here. So the proof of Lemma 5.3 is easier than that of Theorem 5.1.

Now we are in the position to complete the proof of Theorem 5.1. The proof is by induction on (β, ℓ) . We assume that we have constructed the required family

of multisections on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell',0}(\beta')$ for $\beta' \cap \omega < \beta \cap \omega$ and $\ell' \leq \ell$. We study the case of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. We consider the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. One of its boundary component is

$$(52) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\ell_1,1}(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_{\ell_2,1}(\beta_2)$$

where $\ell_1 + \ell_2 = \ell + 2$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$. Continuous family of multisections on the factors of (52) is already given by induction hypothesis. Moreover the properties 3,4 of the factors of (52) imply that the same properties for the fiber product family of multisections.

For the other type of boundary component

$$(53) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\ell}^{cl}(\tilde{\beta})_{ev_1^{int}} \times_M L$$

we can apply Lemma 5.3 to obtain the required family of multisections. We thus obtain family of multisections which has required properties.

Those families of the multisections on the components of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$ is consistent at the overlapped part. (See [13] Lemma 7.2.55.)

We can then extend it to a neighborhood of the boundary. It is easy to see that this extended one still has the required transversal properties. Therefore we can use relative version of Lemma 5.2 to discuss in the same way as the last section to extend this family of multisections to $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,0}(\beta)$. Since we have only finitely many steps to work out, we can choose our family so that 1 of Theorem 5.1 is satisfied. The proof of Theorem 5.1 is now complete. $\square$

Remark 5.2. See [13] Subsection 7.2.3 for the reason why we need to fix E_0 , ℓ_0 and stop the construction of the multisections after $\beta \cap \omega > E_0$ or $\ell > \ell_0$.

In the same way as Section 3, Theorem 5.1 has the following corollary.

Corollary 5.1. *For each ϵ , E_0 and ℓ_0 , there exists a system of continuous family of multisections on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ $k \geq 0$, $\ell_0 \geq \ell \geq 0$, $\beta \cap \omega \leq E_0$, with the following properties.*

- (1) *It is ϵ -close to the Kuranishi map in C^0 sense.*
- (2) *It is compatible with $\text{forget}_{k+1,1}$.*
- (3) *It is invariant under the cyclic permutation of the boundary marked points.*
- (4) *It is invariant by the permutation of interior marked points.*
- (5) *$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta) \rightarrow L$ induces a submersion on its zero set.*
- (6) *We consider the decomposition of the boundary:*

$$(54) \quad \partial\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq j+1 \leq k+1} \bigcup_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} \bigcup_{L_1 \cup L_2 = \{1, \dots, \ell\}} \mathcal{M}_{\#L_1, j-i+1}(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_i} \mathcal{M}_{\#L_2, k-j+i}(\beta_2).$$

(See [13] Subsection 7.1.1.) Then the restriction of our family of multisections of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,k+1}(\beta)$ in the left hand side coincides with the fiber product family of multisections in the right hand side.

6. CYCLIC FILTERED A_{∞} ALGEBRA AND CYCLIC FILTERED A_{∞} ALGEBRA MODULO T^E

Let $\overline{C}$ be a graded vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ and n be a positive integer. We consider $\mathbb{R}$ bilinear map

$$(55) \quad \langle \cdot \rangle : \overline{C}^k \otimes \overline{C}^{n-k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

such that

$$(56) \quad \langle x, y \rangle = (-1)^{1+\deg' x \deg' y} \langle y, x \rangle.$$

Here and hereafter

$$\deg' x = \deg x - 1.$$

We consider a sequence of operators

$$(57) \quad \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k : B_k(\overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]$$

of degree 1, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ (Here $B_k(\overline{\mathcal{C}}[1])$ is the tensor product of k copies of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]$.)

Definition 6.1. We say $(\overline{\mathcal{C}}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty)$ is a *cyclic A_∞ algebra* of dimension n if:

- (1) $\{\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfies the following A_∞ relation:

$$(58) \quad \sum_{k_1+k_2=k+1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} (-1)^* \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_{k_1}(x_1, \dots, \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_{k_2}(x_i, \dots, x_{i+k_2-1}), \dots, x_k) = 0,$$

where $*$ = $\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$.

- (2) We have:

$$(59) \quad \langle \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle = (-1)^* \langle \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}), \mathbf{x}_k \rangle,$$

where $*$ = $\deg' x_0(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_k)$.

- (3) $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is non-degenerate and induces a perfect pairing on $H(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) = \text{Ker } \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1 / \text{Im } \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1$.

We remark that $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1 \circ \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1 = 0$ by 1. Therefore $H(\overline{\mathcal{C}})$ is well-defined. 2 implies $\langle \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1(x), y \rangle = \pm \langle \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1(y), x \rangle$ Therefore $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ induces one on $H(\overline{\mathcal{C}})$ which satisfies (56).

Example 6.1. Let M be an n -dimensional oriented closed manifold. Let $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \Lambda(M)$ be the de-Rham complex. We put

$$\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1(u) = (-1)^{\deg u} du, \quad \overline{\mathfrak{m}}_2(u, v) = (-1)^{\deg u \deg v + \deg u} u \wedge v,$$

$\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k = 0$ for $k \neq 1, 2$, and

$$\langle u, v \rangle = (-1)^{\deg u \deg v + \deg u} \int_M u \wedge v.$$

Definition 6.2. We say a subset $G \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$ a *discrete submonoid* if the following holds. We denote by $E : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu : G \rightarrow 2\mathbb{Z}$ the projections to each of the component.

- (1) If $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in G$ then $\beta_1 + \beta_2 \in G$. $(0, 0) \in G$.
- (2) The image $E(G) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is discrete.
- (3) For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ the inverse image $G \cap E^{-1}(\lambda)$ is a finite set.

We remark that 1,2,3 imply that $E^{-1}(0) \cap G = \{(0, 0)\}$.

Definition 6.3. We put

$$\Lambda_0^G = \left\{ \sum a_\beta T^{E(\beta)} e^{\mu(\beta)/2} \mid \beta \in G, a_\beta \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

where the sum may be either finite or infinite sum. For each $E_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ we have a filtration

$$F^{E_0} \Lambda_0^G = \left\{ \sum a_\beta T^{E(\beta)} e^{\mu(\beta)/2} \in \Lambda_0^G \mid E(\beta) \geq E_0 \right\}.$$

It determines a topology on Λ_0^G with which Λ_0^G is complete.

We define a grading on Λ_0^G by $\deg T = 0$, $\deg e = 2$.

We remark that Λ_0^G contains a (semi)-group ring of the monoid G that is nothing but the element of Λ_0^G with only finitely many nonzero a_β . Λ_0^G is its completion.

The universal Novikov ring $\Lambda_{0, nov}$ which was introduced by [11] is the union (inductive limit) of all Λ_0^G for various discrete submonoids G .

Definition 6.4. A G -gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra structure on $\overline{C}$ is a sequence of operators

$$(60) \quad \mathbf{m}_{k, \beta} : B_k(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{C}[1]$$

for each $\beta \in G$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ of degree $1 - \mu(\beta)$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ with the following properties.

- (1) $\mathbf{m}_{0, \beta} = 0$ for $\beta = (0, 0)$.
- (2)

$$(61) \quad \sum_{k_1 + k_2 = k+1} \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} (-1)^* \mathbf{m}_{k_1, \beta_1}(x_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}(x_i, \dots, x_{i+k_2-1}), \dots, x_k) = 0,$$

holds for any $\beta \in G$ and k . Here the sign is as in (6.1).

- (3) $\langle \cdot \rangle$ satisfies (55), (56) and

$$(62) \quad \langle \mathbf{m}_{k, \beta}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle = (-1)^* \langle \mathbf{m}_{k, \beta}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}), \mathbf{x}_k \rangle,$$

holds for any β and k . Here the sign is as in (59). 3 of Definition 6.1 also holds.

Definition 6.5. A G -gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra structure modulo T^{E_0} is sequence of operators (60) for $E(\beta) < E_0$ which satisfies the same properties, except (61) and (62) are assumed only for $E(\beta) < E_0$.

Definition 6.6. $\mathbf{e} \in \overline{C}$ of degree 0 is said to be a (strict) unit of A_∞ algebra if

$$(63) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{e}, x) &= (-1)^{\deg x} \mathbf{m}_2(x, \mathbf{e}) = x, \\ \mathbf{m}_k(\dots, \mathbf{e}, \dots) &= 0 \quad \text{for } k \neq 2. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{e}$ is said to be a unit of filtered A_∞ algebra if

$$(64) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_{2, (0, 0)}(\mathbf{e}, x) &= (-1)^{\deg x} \mathbf{m}_{2, (0, 0)}(x, \mathbf{e}) = x, \\ \mathbf{m}_{k, \beta}(\dots, \mathbf{e}, \dots) &= 0 \quad \text{for } (k, \beta) \neq (2, (0, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

Unit for filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^E is defined in the same way. (filtered) A_∞ algebra with unit is said to be unital.

We put

$$\mathbf{m}_k = \sum_{\beta} T^{E(\beta)} e^{\mu(\beta)/2} \mathbf{m}_{k, \beta} : B_k(C[1]) \rightarrow C[1].$$

It satisfies (58), (59).

Remark 6.1. The sign convention of this paper is slightly different from one in [13]. We explain the difference below. In [13] the inner product

$$(65) \quad (u, v) = (-1)^{\deg u \deg v} \int_L u \wedge v = (-1)^{\deg u} \langle u, v \rangle$$

is used. (See [13] Remark 8.4.7 (1).) Then the cyclic symmetry of $\mathbf{m}_k$ takes the form

$$(66) \quad (x_0, \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_1, \dots, x_k)) = (-1)^*(x_1, \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_2, \dots, x_k, x_0)),$$

where $*$ = $\deg' x_0(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_k)$. (See [13] Proposition 8.4.8.)

Lemma 6.1. *If $(\cdot)$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ are related by (65), then (62) is equivalent to (66).*

Proof. We assume (65) and (66). Then we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_1, \dots, x_k), x_0 \rangle \\ &= (-1)^{\sum_{i=1}^k \deg' x_i} (\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_1, \dots, x_k), x_0) \\ &= (-1)^{(\sum_{i=1}^k \deg' x_i)(\deg' x_0)} (x_0, \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_1, \dots, x_k)) \\ &= (x_1, \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_2, \dots, x_k, x_0)) \\ &= (-1)^{*1} (\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_2, \dots, x_k, x_0), x_1) \\ &= (-1)^{*2} \langle \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(x_2, \dots, x_k, x_0), x_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$*1 = \left(\sum_{i \neq 1} \deg' x_i \right) (\deg' x_1 + 1),$$

and

$$*2 = *1 + \sum_{i \neq 1} \deg' x_i = \left(\sum_{i \neq 1} \deg' x_i \right) \deg' x_1.$$

We thus have (62). The proof of the converse is similar. $\square$

By Lemma 6.1 we can apply the discussion of orientation and sign in [13] Subsection 8.4.2 for the purpose of this paper.

7. CYCLIC FILTERED A_∞ STRUCTURE MODULO T^E ON DE-RHAM COMPLEX

The main result of this section is as follows.

Theorem 7.1. *For any relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold L of (M, ω) . We can assign G such that for each $E_0 > 0$ the de Rham complex $\Lambda(L)$ has a structure of G gapped cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^{E_0} .*

Proof. This theorem follows from Corollary 5.1 as follows. We fix tame almost complex structure J and let G be the submonoid of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$ generated by the set

$$\{(\beta \cap \omega, \mu(\beta)) \mid \beta \in H_2(X, L; \mathbb{Z}), \mathcal{M}_0(\beta) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Gromov compactness implies that G satisfies the conditions in Definition 6.2.

We apply Corollary 5.1 by putting E_0 as above and $\ell = 0$. Then for $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k \in \Lambda(L)$, we define

$$(67) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k) \\ &= \text{Corr}(\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta); (ev_1, \dots, ev_k), ev_0)(\rho_1 \times \dots \times \rho_k) \in \Lambda(L), \end{aligned}$$

for $\beta \neq (0,0)$. Since ev_0 is weakly submersive by Corollary 5.1.5, the right hand side is well-defined and is a smooth form. We define $\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta_0}$ for $\beta_0 = (0,0)$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ as in (6.1).

The cyclic symmetry follows from Corollary 5.1.4 (up to sign) as follows. By Lemma 4.2 and definitions we have:

$$(68) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k), \rho_0 \rangle \\ &= \text{Corr}(\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta), (ev_1, \dots, ev_k, ev_0), \text{const})(\rho_1 \times \dots \times \rho_k \times \rho_0) \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 5.1.4 the right hand side of (68) is cyclically symmetric.

Filtered A_∞ relation (61) is a consequence of Corollary 5.1.6 (up to sign) and Propositions 4.2 and 4.3. (See [13] Section 3.5.)

The (strict) unitality (63) follows from Corollary 5.1.2 as follows. We consider $\beta \neq (0,0)$ and $k \geq 1$ and studies

$$(69) \quad \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{i-1}, 1, \rho_{i+1}, \dots, \rho_k).$$

Here $1 \in \Lambda^0(L)$ is the 0 form $\equiv 1$. We consider the forgetful map

$$\text{forget}_i : \mathcal{M}_k(\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{k-1}(\beta)$$

which forgets i -th marked point. We have chosen the Kuranishi structure and the (family of) multisections are invariant of forgetful map. We consider the expression (44).

$$(70) \quad \sum_i f_\alpha^t \frac{1}{l_i} \chi_i((f_\alpha^s)^* \rho \wedge \omega_\alpha)|_{s_{\alpha,i,j}}$$

In our case $\rho = \rho_1 \times \dots \times \rho_{i-1} \times 1 \times \rho_{i+1} \times \dots \times \rho_k$. Let X be the vector field tangent to the fiber of forget_i . Then we have

$$i_X((f_\alpha^s)^* \rho \wedge \omega_\alpha) = 0.$$

On the other hand, $f^t = ev_0$ factors through forget_i . Therefore, (70) is zero in our case. Since (69) is obtained from (70) by summing up using partition of unity, it follows that (69) is zero also. We thus proved the strict unitality.

We finally remark that we can handle the sign in the same way as [13] Subsection 8.10.3 and [7] Section 12. Namely we can reduce the sign in the de Rham version to one in singular homology version. $\square$

Remark 7.1. We remark that the evaluation map ev_0 from our perturbed moduli space is submersive. This is enough to work with de Rham theory since we can pull back differential forms by $ev_1, \dots, ev_k$ without assuming its submersivity.

In case we work with (singular) chains, we need to take fiber product of singular chains P_i of L with our perturbed moduli space by evaluation maps $ev_1, \dots, ev_k$. This requires submersivity of $ev_1, \dots, ev_k$. As we explained in Remark 3.2 it is impossible to do so while keeping compatibility with forgetful map.

8. HOMOLOGICAL ALGEBRA OF CYCLIC FILTERED A_∞ ALGEBRA: STATEMENT

In Sections 8-10 we study homological algebra of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra. We follow [18] in various places. (See also [2].) However our discussion is different from [18] not only we study filtered case also but also in several other points. In [18] $\langle u, v \rangle \neq 0$ only when $\deg u + \deg v$ is odd. Thus our situation is included in [18] when $\dim L$ is odd. In that case according to Remark 2.1.2 [18], the sign convention of cyclic symmetry in [18] is similar to (66) (that is the convention of [13]). The

notion of pseudo-isotopy of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra which we introduce in this section is also new.

We first review the definition of filtered A_∞ homomorphism from [13] Chapter 4. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$ be a discrete submonoid and $(C, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}\})$, $(C', \{\mathbf{m}'_{k,\beta}\})$ be G -gapped filtered A_∞ algebras.

Definition 8.1. A sequence of $\mathbb{R}$ -linear maps

$$\mathbf{f}_{k,\beta} : B_k(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{C}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta)$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, $\beta \in G$ is said to be a G -gapped filtered A_∞ homomorphism if:

- (1) $\mathbf{f}_{0,(0,0)} = 0$.
- (2) For each β , $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, with $(k, \beta) \neq (0, (0, 0))$ and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \overline{C}[1]$, we have

$$(71) \quad \sum \mathbf{m}_{\ell,\beta_0}(\mathbf{f}_{k_1,\beta_1}(x_1, \dots), \dots, \mathbf{f}_{k_\ell,\beta_\ell}(\dots, x_k)) \\ = \sum_{k_1+k_2=k+1} \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} (-1)^* \mathbf{f}_{\beta_1,k_1}(x_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}(x_i, \dots), \dots, x_k)$$

Here the sum in the left hand side is taken over ℓ , β_i , k_i such that $\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_\ell = \beta$ and $k_1 + \dots + k_\ell = k$, and the sign in the right hand side is $*$ = $\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$.

In case $\mathbf{f}_{k,\beta}$ is defined only for $E(\beta) < E_0$ and (71) holds only for $E(\beta) < E_0$, we call it a filtered A_∞ homomorphism modulo T^{E_0} . This is defined if $(C, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}\})$, $(C', \{\mathbf{m}'_{k,\beta}\})$ are filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^{E_0} .

Definition 8.2. (1) A filtered A_∞ homomorphism is said to be *strict* if $\mathbf{f}_{0,\beta} = 0$ for any β .

- (2) Suppose $(C, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}\})$, $(C', \{\mathbf{m}'_{k,\beta}\})$ are unital. We say a filtered A_∞ homomorphism to be *unital* if:

$$(72) \quad \mathbf{f}_{1,\beta}(\mathbf{e}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e} & \text{if } \beta = (0, 0), \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta \neq (0, 0). \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{f}_{k,\beta}(\dots, \mathbf{e}, \dots) = 0, \quad k > 1.$$

- (3) We say a filtered algebra or homomorphism to be *gapped* in case it is G -gapped for some G , which we do not specify.

Definition 8.3 ([18] Definition 2.13). Let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}\})$, $(C', \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}'_{k,\beta}\})$ be G -gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras. A G -gapped filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\mathbf{f} = \{\mathbf{f}_{k,\beta} : C \rightarrow C'\}$ is said to be *cyclic* if the following holds.

$$(73) \quad \langle \mathbf{f}_{1,(0,0)}(x), \mathbf{f}_{1,(0,0)}(y) \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle$$

for any x, y .

$$(74) \quad \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \langle \mathbf{f}_{k_1,\beta_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}), \mathbf{f}_{k_2,\beta_2}(x_{k_1+1}, \dots, x_k) \rangle = 0,$$

holds for $(k, \beta) \neq (2, (0, 0))$ and $x_1, \dots, x_k$.

In case (74) holds only for $E(\beta) < E_0$ we say that it is cyclic modulo T^{E_0} .

We define composition of filtered A_∞ homomorphism as in [13] Definition 3.2.31. It is easy to see that composition of cyclic filtered A_∞ homomorphisms are cyclic.

- Remark 8.1.** (1) We say a (cyclic) filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\{f_{k,\beta}\}$ to be a *weak homotopy equivalence* if $f_{1,(0,0)}$ induces isomorphism on $\mathfrak{m}_{1,(0,0)}$.
- (2) We say a filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\{f_{k,\beta}\}$ is an *isomorphism* if it has an inverse, that is a filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\{g_{k,\beta}\}$ such that the compositions of them are identity. (An identity morphism $\{h_{k,\beta}\}$ is defined by $h_{k,\beta} = 0$ for $(k,\beta) \neq (1,(0,0))$ and $h_{1,(0,0)} = \text{identity}$. It is easy to see that an inverse of cyclic filtered A_∞ homomorphism is automatically cyclic.

We next define and study the properties of pseudo-isotopy of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras. Let $\overline{C}$ be a graded $\mathbb{R}$ vector space. We take a basis $\mathbf{e}_i$ of $\overline{C}^k$ and define $C^\infty([0,1], \overline{C}^k)$ to be a finite sum

$$\sum_i a_i(t) \mathbf{e}_i$$

such that $a_i : [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions.

Remark 8.2. In case $\overline{C} = \Lambda(L)$ the de Rham complex, we need to take into account the Fréchet topology of $\Lambda(L)$ and define $C^\infty([0,1], \overline{C})$ in a different way. See Section 11.

We consider the set of formal sums

$$(75) \quad a(t) + dt \wedge b(t)$$

where $a(t) \in C^\infty([0,1], \overline{C}^k)$, $b(t) \in C^\infty([0,1], \overline{C}^{k-1})$. We write the totality of such (75) by $C^\infty([0,1] \times \overline{C})^k$. We will consider filtered A_∞ structure on it. More precisely we proceed as follows.

We assume that, for each $t \in [0,1]$, we have operations:

$$(76) \quad \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t : B_k(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{C}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta) + 1$ and

$$(77) \quad \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t : B_k(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{C}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta)$.

Definition 8.4. We say $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t$ is *smooth* if for each $x_1, \dots, x_k$

$$t \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t(x_1, \dots, x_k)$$

is an element of $C^\infty([0,1], \overline{C})$.

The smoothness of $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t$ is defined in the same way.

Definition 8.5. We say $(C, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ is a *pseudo-isotopy* of G -gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras if the following holds:

- (1) $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t$ and $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t$ are smooth.
- (2) For each (but fixed) t , the triple $(C, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ defines a cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra.
- (3) For each (but fixed) t , and $x_i \in \overline{C}[1]$, we have

$$(78) \quad \langle \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t(x_1, \dots, x_k), x_0 \rangle = (-1)^* \langle \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}), x_k \rangle$$

$$* = (\deg \mathbf{x}_0 + 1)(\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \deg \mathbf{x}_k + k).$$

(4) For each $x_i \in \overline{C}[1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\
 & + \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} (-1)^* \mathbf{c}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(x_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots, x_k) \\
 & - \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} \mathbf{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(x_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots, x_k) \\
 & = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Here $*$ = $\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$.

(5) $\mathbf{m}_{k,(0,0)}^t$ is independent of t . $\mathbf{c}_{k,(0,0)}^t = 0$.

Remark 8.3. The condition 5 above may be a bit more restrictive than optional definition. We assume it here since it suffices for the purpose of this paper.

We consider $x_i(t) + dt \wedge y_i(t) = \mathbf{x}_i \in C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{C})$. We define

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{k,\beta}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = x(t) + dt \wedge y(t)$$

where

$$x(t) = \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t(x_1(t), \dots, x_k(t)) \tag{80a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 y(t) = & \mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t(x_1(t), \dots, x_k(t)) \\
 & - \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{*i} \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t(x_1(t), \dots, x_{i-1}(t), y_i(t), x_{i+1}(t), \dots, x_k(t))
 \end{aligned} \tag{80b}$$

if $(k, \beta) \neq (1, (0, 0))$ and

$$y(t) = \frac{d}{dt} x_1(t) + \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}^t(y_1(t)) \tag{80c}$$

if $(k, \beta) = (1, (0, 0))$. Here $*i$ in (80b) is $*i = \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$.

Lemma 8.1. *The equation (79) is equivalent to the filtered A_∞ relation of $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{k,\beta}$ defined by (80).*

The proof is straightforward and is omitted. (See [13] Lemma 4.2.13.) We define $\langle \cdot \rangle_{t_0}$ on $C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{C})$ by

$$\langle x_1(t) + dt \wedge y_1(t), x_2(t) + dt \wedge y_2(t) \rangle_{t_0} = \langle x_1(t_0), x_2(t_0) \rangle.$$

Then $(C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{C}), \langle \cdot \rangle_{t_0}, \{\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{k,\beta}\})$ is a cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra for any t_0 .

Definition 8.6. A pseudo-isotopy $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ is said to be *unital* if there exists $\mathbf{e} \in \overline{C}^0$ such that $\mathbf{e}$ is a unit of $(C, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ for each t and if

$$\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t(\dots, \mathbf{e}, \dots) = 0$$

for each k, β and t .

Definition 8.7. Let $(\overline{C}, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,(0,0)}\})$ be a (unfiltered) cyclic A_∞ algebra. We consider two G -gapped filtered cyclic A_∞ algebras $(\overline{C}, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^i\})$ ($i = 0, 1$) such that $\mathbf{m}_{k,(0,0)}^i = \mathbf{m}_{k,(0,0)}$ for $i = 0, 1$.

We say $(\overline{C}, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^0\})$ is pseudo-isotopic to $(\overline{C}, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^1\})$ if there exists a pseudo-isotopy $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ with given boundary value at $t = 0, 1$.

Modulo T^{E_0} and/or unital version is defined in a similar way.

Lemma 8.2. *Pseudo-isotopy of G -gapped filtered cyclic A_∞ algebras is an equivalence relation.*

Modulo T^{E_0} version also holds.

Proof. Let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ be a pseudo-isotopy. First we show that we can modify them so that $\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t$ is locally constant of t and that $\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t = 0$, in a neighborhood of $t \in \partial[0, 1]$, as follows. Let $t = t(s)$ be a smooth map $[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which is constant in a neighborhood of 0, 1 and $t(1) = 1$, $t(0) = 0$. We put:

$$(81) \quad \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^s = \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{t(s)}, \quad \mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^s = \frac{dt}{ds}(s) \cdot \mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^{t(s)}.$$

It is easy to see that $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^s\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^s\})$ is a required pseudo-isotopy.

Now we can easily join two pseudo-isotopies satisfying the above additional condition. It implies that ‘pseudo-isotopic’ is transitive. The other properties are easier to check. $\square$

Theorem 8.1. *Let $E_0 < E_1$ and $(\overline{C}, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^i\})$ ($i = 0, 1$) be G -gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^{E_i} . Let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ be a pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_0} between them. Then:*

- (1) *We can extend $(\overline{C}, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^0\})$ to a G -gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^{E_1} .*
- (2) *We can extend $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ to a pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_1} between them.*

Unital version also holds.

The proof will be given in Section 9.

Theorem 8.2. *If $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ is a pseudo-isotopy then there exists a filtered A_∞ homomorphism from $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^0\})$ to $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^1\})$ which is cyclic and has an inverse.*

Modulo T^E and/or unital version also holds.

The proof will be given in Section 9.

Remark 8.4. It is possible to prove that gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ homomorphism which is homotopy equivalence (as gapped filtered A_∞ homomorphism) has a homotopy inverse which is cyclic. See [18] Theorem 5.17. The explicit construction of homotopy inverse given in [1] proves it also.

One reason why we built our story without using this theorem but used pseudo-isotopy more is that it seems that ‘pseudo-isotopic’ is strictly stronger than ‘homotopy equivalent’. (An invariant of a kind of ‘Reidemeister torsion’ may distinguish them.) So for future application (especially one in [8]) to keep track of pseudo-isotopy type rather than homotopy type seems essential.

This does not seem to be the case when we do not include cyclic symmetry and inner product in the story.

Let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}\})$ be a G -gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra. We have $\mathfrak{m}_{1,(0,0)} \circ \mathfrak{m}_{1,(0,0)} = 0 : \overline{C} \rightarrow \overline{C}$. We put

$$\overline{H} = \frac{\text{Ker } \mathfrak{m}_{1,(0,0)}}{\text{Im } \mathfrak{m}_{1,(0,0)}}.$$

In [13] Theorem 5.4.2', G -gapped filtered A_∞ structure $\{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}\}$ on $\overline{H}$ is defined. Moreover G -gapped filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\mathfrak{f} : H \rightarrow C$, (which is a homotopy equivalence) is defined. By (61) the inner product $\langle \cdot \rangle$ on $\overline{C}$ induces one on $\overline{H}$, which we denote also by $\langle \cdot \rangle$.

Theorem 8.3. *We assume either $\overline{C}$ is finite dimensional or is a de Rham complex. Then, $(H, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}\})$ is cyclic. Moreover $\mathfrak{f} : H \rightarrow C$ is cyclic.*

The modulo T^{E_0} and/or unital version is also true.

We will prove Theorem 8.3 in Section 10.

Definition 8.8. We call $(H, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}\})$ the *canonical model* of cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}\})$.

Weak homotopy equivalence between (cyclic) canonical filtered A_∞ algebras is an isomorphism. ([13] Proposition 5.4.5.)

Theorem 8.4. *If $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^0\})$ is pseudo-isotopic to $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^1\})$ then their canonical models are also pseudo-isotopic to each other.*

We prove Theorem 8.4 in Section 10.

9. PSEUDO-ISOTOPY OF CYCLIC FILTERED A_∞ ALGEBRAS

In this section we prove Theorems 8.1 and 8.2. We begin with the proof of Theorem 8.2. We will construct the required isomorphism by taking appropriate sum over trees with some additional data, which we describe below.

A *ribbon tree* is a tree T together with isotopy type of an embedding $T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. (This is equivalent to fix cyclic order of the set of edges containing given vertex.) A *rooted ribbon tree* is a pair (T, v_0) of a ribbon tree T and its vertex v_0 such that v_0 has exactly one edges. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$ be a discrete submonoid. We consider triple $\Gamma = (T, v_0, \beta(\cdot))$ together with some other data which has the following properties:

- (1) (T, v_0) is a rooted ribbon tree.
- (2) The set of vertices $C_0(T)$ is divided into disjoint union $C_0^{\text{int}}(T) \cup C_0^{\text{ext}}(T)$. $v_0 \in C_0^{\text{ext}}(T)$. Each of $v \in C_0^{\text{ext}}(T)$ has exactly one edge.
- (3) $\beta(\cdot) : C_0^{\text{int}}(T) \rightarrow G$ is a map.
- (4) If $\beta(v) = (0, 0)$ then, v has at least 3 edges.

Definition 9.1. We write $Gr(\beta, k)$ the set of all $(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot))$ as above such that

- (1) $\sum_{v \in C_0^{\text{int}}(T)} \beta(v) = \beta$.
- (2) $\#C_0^{\text{ext}}(T) = k + 1$.

We call an element of $C_0^{\text{ext}}(T)$ an *exterior vertex* and an element of $C_0^{\text{int}}(T)$ an *interior vertex*. An edge is said *exterior* if it contains an exterior edge. It is called *interior* otherwise. The set of exterior edges and interior edges are denoted by $C_1^{\text{ext}}(T)$ and $C_1^{\text{int}}(T)$, respectively.

We call v_0 the *root* of (T, v_0) .

Definition 9.2 (See [13] Definition 4.6.6.). For a rooted ribbon tree (T, v_0) we define a partial order $<$ on $C_0(T)$ as follows.

$v < v'$ if all the paths joining v with v_0 contains v' .

Definition 9.3 (See [13] Definition 7.1.53). The *time allocation* of an element $(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) \in Gr(\beta, k)$ is a map $\tau : C_0^{\text{int}}(T) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that if $v < v'$ then $\tau(v) \leq \tau(v')$.

We denote by $\mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot); \tau_1, \tau_0)$ the set of all time allocations τ such that $\tau(v) \in [\tau_0, \tau_1]$ for all v . We write $\mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) = \mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot); 1, 0)$.

We may regard

$$(82) \quad \mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) \subseteq [0, 1]^{\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T)}.$$

For $(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) \in Gr(\beta, k)$ and $\tau \in \mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot))$ we will associate an $\mathbb{R}$ linear map

$$\mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot), \tau) : B_k(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{C}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta)$ by induction on $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T)$ as follows.

Suppose $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T) = 0$. Then T has only one edge and two (exterior) vertices. So $\beta(\cdot)$ is void. We put

$$(83) \quad \mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot), \tau) = \text{identity},$$

in this case.

Suppose $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T) = 1$. Let v be the unique interior vertex. $\beta = \beta(v)$. v has exactly $k + 1$ edges. We put

$$(84) \quad \mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot), \tau)(x_1, \dots, x_k) = -\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{\tau(v)}(x_1, \dots, x_k).$$

Let $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T) > 1$. We take the unique edge e_0 containing v_0 . Let v'_0 be the edge of e_0 other than v_0 . v'_0 is necessarily interior. We remove v_0 , e_0 and v'_0 from T and then obtain ℓ components $T_1, \dots, T_\ell$. Here $\ell + 1$ is the number of edges of v'_0 . We number them so that $v'_0, T_1, \dots, T_\ell$ respects counter clockwise cyclic order induced by the canonical orientation of $\mathbb{R}^2$. We take the closures of T_i and denote it by the same symbol, by an abuse of notation. Together with the other data which is induced in an obvious way from one of $(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot), \tau)$ we obtain $(T_i, v'_0, \beta_i(\cdot), \tau_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. We now put

$$(85) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot), \tau) \\ &= -\mathfrak{c}_{\ell, \beta(v'_0)}^{\tau(v'_0)} \circ (\mathfrak{c}(T_1, v'_0, \beta_1(\cdot), \tau_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{c}(T_\ell, v'_0, \beta_\ell(\cdot), \tau_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

Note the right hand side is already defined by induction hypothesis.

Now we integrate on $\mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot))$ and define:

$$(86) \quad \mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) = \int_{\tau \in \mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot))} \mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot), \tau) d\tau.$$

Here we regard $\mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) \subset [0, 1]^{\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T)}$ and use standard measure $d\tau$ to integrate. We define $\mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot); \tau_1, \tau_0)$ in the same way by integrating on $\mathfrak{M}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot); \tau_1, \tau_0)$.

Definition 9.4.

$$(87) \quad \mathfrak{c}(k, \beta) = \sum_{(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) \in Gr(k, \beta)} \mathfrak{c}(T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)).$$

We define $\mathfrak{c}(k, \beta; \tau_1, \tau_0)$ in a similar way.

Proposition 9.1. $\{\mathfrak{c}(k, \beta; \tau_1, \tau_0)\}$ defines a G gapped filtered A_∞ homomorphism from $(C, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{\tau_0}\})$ to $(C, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{\tau_1}\})$.

Proof. Let $E(G) = \{0, E_1, \dots, E_k, \dots\}$ with $E_i < E_{i+1}$. We are going to prove that $\{\mathfrak{c}(k, \beta; \tau_1, \tau_0)\}$ is a filtered A_∞ homomorphism modulo E_j by induction on j .

We remark that

$$(88) \quad \mathfrak{c}(k, (0, 0)) = \begin{cases} \text{identity} & \text{if } k = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

by Definition 8.5.5. The case $j = 0 + 1 = 1$ follows immediately.

We assume that $\{\mathfrak{c}(k, \beta; \tau, \tau_0)\}$ is a filtered A_∞ homomorphism modulo E_j . Let $E(\beta) = E_j$. We will study the following two maps (89), (90).

$$(89) \quad \sum \mathfrak{m}_{\ell, \beta_0}^\tau \circ (\mathfrak{c}(k_1, \beta_1; \tau, \tau_0) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{c}(k_\ell, \beta_\ell; \tau, \tau_0))$$

where the sum is taken over all ℓ, k_i, β_i with $\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_\ell = \beta, k_1 + \dots + k_\ell = k$.

$$(90) \quad x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_k \mapsto \sum (-1)^* \mathfrak{c}(\beta_1, k_1; \tau, \tau_0)(x_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^{\tau_0}(x_i, \dots), \dots, x_k)$$

where the sum is taken over $k_1, k_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, i$ with $k_1 + k_2 = k + 1, \beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$ and $i = 1, \dots, k - k_2 + 1$ and $* = \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$.

We denote (89) by $\mathfrak{P}(k, \beta; \tau, \tau_0)$ and (90) by $\mathfrak{Q}(k, \beta; \tau, \tau_0)$. To prove Proposition 9.1 it suffices to show $\mathfrak{P}(k, \beta; \tau, \tau_0) = \mathfrak{Q}(k, \beta; \tau, \tau_0)$.

We calculate

$$(91) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathfrak{P}(k, \beta; \tau, \tau_0) \\ &= \sum \left(\frac{d}{d\tau} \mathfrak{m}_{\ell, \beta_0}^\tau \right) \circ (\mathfrak{c}(k_1, \beta_1; \tau, \tau_0) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{c}(k_\ell, \beta_\ell; \tau, \tau_0)) \\ & \quad + \mathfrak{m}_{\ell, \beta_0}^\tau \circ \frac{d}{d\tau} (\mathfrak{c}(k_1, \beta_1; \tau, \tau_0) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{c}(k_\ell, \beta_\ell; \tau, \tau_0)) \end{aligned}$$

By using (79) the first term of (91) becomes the sum of the following two formulas:

(1) The sum of the composition of

$$(92) \quad \mathfrak{c}(k_1, \beta_1; \tau, \tau_0) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{c}(k_\ell, \beta_\ell; \tau, \tau_0)$$

and

$$(93) \quad x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_\ell \mapsto (-1)^* \mathfrak{c}_{\ell_1, \beta_0}^\tau(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{\ell_2, \beta'_0}^\tau(x_i, \dots), \dots).$$

Here the sum is taken over all $\beta_0, \beta'_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell, \ell_1, \ell_2, k_1, \dots, k_\ell$ such that $\beta = \beta_0 + \beta'_0 + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_\ell, \ell_1 + \ell_2 = \ell + 1, k_1 + \dots + k_\ell = k$. The sign is $* = \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$.

(2) The composition of (92) and

$$(94) \quad x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_\ell \mapsto -\mathfrak{m}_{\ell_1, \beta_0}^\tau(\dots, \mathfrak{c}_{\ell_2, \beta'_0}^\tau(x_i, \dots), \dots).$$

We remark that the minus sign in (94) is induced by the minus sign in the 3rd line of (79).

Using induction hypothesis, we can show that 1 above is equal to (90). (Note the minus sign in (84), (85) is essential here.)

On the other hand, by definition we can show that 2 above cancels with the second term of (91). (We again use the minus sign in (84), (85) here.)

The proof of Proposition 9.1 is now complete. $\square$

Proposition 9.2. *The filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\{\mathbf{c}(k, \beta)\}$ is cyclic.*

Proof. Let $(k, \beta) \neq (2, (0, 0))$. We will prove:

$$(95) \quad \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ \beta_1+\beta_2=\beta}} \langle \mathbf{c}(k_1, \beta_1)(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}), \mathbf{c}(k_2, \beta_2)(x_{k_1+1}, \dots, x_k) \rangle = 0.$$

A term of (95) is written as

$$(96) \quad \int_{\tau \in \mathfrak{M}(\Gamma_1)} \int_{\tau' \in \mathfrak{M}(\Gamma_2)} \langle \mathbf{c}(\Gamma_1; \tau)(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}), \mathbf{c}(\Gamma_2; \tau')(x_{k_1+1}, \dots, x_k) \rangle d\tau d\tau'.$$

Here $\Gamma_i = (T_i, v_0^i, \beta_i(\dots)) \in Gr(k_i, \beta_i)$ with $k_1 + k_2 = k$, $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$.

We put

$$\tau_{\max} = \max\{\tau(v) \mid v \in C_0^{\text{int}}(T_1)\} = \tau(v_0^{1'}).$$

Here $v_0^{1'}$ is the unique interior vertex which is joined with v_0^1 . We define

$$\tau'_{\max} = \max\{\tau'(v) \mid v \in C_0^{\text{int}}(T_2)\} = \tau'(v_0^{2'}),$$

in the same way. We divide the domain of integration (96) into two:

- (1) $\tau_{\max} \geq \tau'_{\max}$.
- (2) $\tau_{\max} \leq \tau'_{\max}$.

Integration on the domain 1, is the sum of the terms:

$$(97) \quad - \int_0^1 \left\langle (\mathbf{c}_{\ell, \beta(0)}^t \circ (\mathbf{c}(\Gamma(1); t, \tau_0) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{c}(\Gamma(\ell); t, \tau_0)))(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}), \right. \\ \left. \mathbf{c}(\Gamma(0); t, \tau_0)(x_{k_1+1}, \dots, x_k) \right\rangle dt.$$

Here $\Gamma(i) = (T_i, v_0^i, \beta^i(\dots)) \in Gr(k(i), \beta^i)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^\ell k(i) = k_1$, $k(0) = k_2$, $k_1 + k_2 = k$, $\sum_{i=0}^\ell \beta^i + \beta^0 + \beta_{(0)} = \beta$.

In a similar way, Integration on the domain 2, is the sum of the terms:

$$(98) \quad - \int_0^1 \left\langle \mathbf{c}(\Gamma(0); t, \tau_0)(x_1, \dots, x_{k_2}), \right. \\ \left. (\mathbf{c}_{\ell, \beta(0)}^t \circ (\mathbf{c}(\Gamma(1); t, \tau_0) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{c}(\Gamma(\ell); t, \tau_0)))(x_{k_2+1}, \dots, x_k) \right\rangle dt.$$

Therefore (95) follows from the following:

Lemma 9.1.

$$(99) \quad \langle \mathbf{c}_{\ell, \beta}^t(x_1, \dots, x_\ell), x_0 \rangle + \langle x_1, \mathbf{c}_{\ell, \beta}^t(x_2, \dots, x_\ell, x_0) \rangle = 0.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathbf{c}_{\ell, \beta}^t(x_1, \dots, x_\ell), x_0 \rangle \\ &= (-1)^{(\deg' x_1)(\sum_{i \neq 1} \deg' x_i)} \langle \mathbf{c}_{\ell, \beta}^t(x_2, \dots, x_\ell, x_0), x_1 \rangle \\ &= -\langle x_1, \mathbf{c}_{\ell, \beta}^t(x_2, \dots, x_\ell, x_0) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use cyclic symmetry of $\mathfrak{c}_{\ell,\beta}^t$ in the first equality and (56) in the second equality. $\square$

The proof of Proposition 9.2 and Theorem 8.1 are complete. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 8.2. We may assume that $E(G) \cap [E_0, E_1] = \{E_0, E_1\}$. (In the general case we can divide the interval $[E_0, E_1]$ into the pieces so that the above assumption holds.)

We use the modulo T^{E_0} version of Theorem 8.1 we proved above and obtain a cyclic filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}\}$ modulo T^{E_0} .

Let $E(\beta) = E_0$. We put $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t = 0$. We then define $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t$ by solving (79). Namely we put

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^\tau(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\
 &= \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^1(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\
 & - \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ \beta_1+\beta_2=\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} (-1)^{*i} \int_\tau^1 \mathfrak{c}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots) dt \\
 & + \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ \beta_1+\beta_2=\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} \int_\tau^1 \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots) dt.
 \end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

Here $*i = \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$.

We remark that if $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t \neq 0$ then $E(\beta) > 0$. Therefore the right hand side of (100) is already defined by induction hypothesis.

1,3,4,5 of Definition 8.5 is obvious.

Lemma 9.2. $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^\tau$ in (100) satisfies the filtered A_∞ relation (61).

Proof. We remark that $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^1$ satisfies (61) by assumption. We prove (61) by induction on $E(\beta)$. Since $\mathfrak{m}_{k,(0,0)}^\tau$ is independent of τ , (61) holds for $E(\beta) = 0$. We assume that it is satisfied for β' with $E(\beta') < E(\beta)$ and consider the case of β . We calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{dt} \left(\sum (-1)^{*i} \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots) \right) \\
 &= \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{c}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_j, \dots), \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots) \\
 & + \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{c}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_j, \dots), \dots) \\
 & + \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{c}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_j, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots), \dots) \\
 & + \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_j, \dots), \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots) \\
 & + \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_j, \dots), \dots) \\
 & + \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_j, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots), \dots) \\
 & + \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_j, \dots), \dots), \dots) \\
 & + \sum (-1)^{*i,j} \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_3,\beta_3}^t(x_j, \dots), \dots), \dots).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the first 6 terms are obtained by differentiating $\mathbf{m}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t$ and the last 2 terms are obtained by differentiating $\mathbf{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t$. The signs are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
*_i^1 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{j-1} \\
*_i^2 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{j-1} + 1 \\
*_i^3 &= \deg' x_j + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} \\
*_i^4 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + 1 \\
*_i^5 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + 1 \\
*_i^6 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + 1 \\
*_i^7 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{j-1} \\
*_i^8 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Now the 1st and 2nd terms cancels. The 3rd term is 0 by induction hypothesis. (A_∞ relation for $\mathbf{m}$. We remark that $\mathbf{c}_{k, \beta} \neq 0$ only if $E(\beta) > 0$.) The sum of 4th, 5th and 8th terms are 0 by induction hypothesis also. 6th and 7th terms cancel. The proof of Lemma 9.2 is now complete. $\square$

Lemma 9.3. $\mathbf{m}_{k, \beta}^\tau$ is cyclically symmetric.

Proof. We consider the following formulas:

$$(101) \quad \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ \beta_1+\beta_2=\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} (-1)^{*_i+1} \langle \mathbf{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathbf{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots), x_0 \rangle,$$

where $*_i = \deg' \rho_1 + \dots + \deg' \rho_{i-1}$ and

$$(102) \quad \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ \beta_1+\beta_2=\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-k_2+1} \langle \mathbf{m}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathbf{c}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots), x_0 \rangle.$$

We denote (101) as $\mathfrak{P}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0)$ and (102) as $\mathfrak{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0)$.

We will prove

$$(103) \quad \mathfrak{P}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) + \mathfrak{Q}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) = (-1)^{(\deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_k)} (\mathfrak{P}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0) + \mathfrak{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0)).$$

We have

$$(104) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{P}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ &= - \sum \langle \mathbf{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\mathbf{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_0, \dots), \dots), x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum (-1)^{\deg' x_0 + *_i + 1} \langle \mathbf{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(x_0, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots), x_k \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(105) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{Q}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ &= \sum \langle \mathbf{m}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\mathbf{c}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_0, \dots), \dots), x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum \langle \mathbf{m}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(x_0, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(\dots), \dots), x_k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
 (106) \quad & (-1)^{(\deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_k)} \mathfrak{P}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0) \\
 &= \sum (-1)^{*+1+*i} \langle \mathfrak{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots, x_k), x_0 \rangle \\
 &\quad + \sum (-1)^{*+*i+1} \langle \mathfrak{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots, x_k)), x_0 \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

with $*$ = $(\deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_k)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (107) \quad & (-1)^{(\deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_k)} \mathfrak{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0) \\
 &= \sum (-1)^* \langle \mathfrak{m}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots), \dots, x_k), x_0 \rangle \\
 &\quad + \sum (-1)^* \langle \mathfrak{m}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\dots, \mathfrak{c}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_i, \dots, x_k)), x_0 \rangle.
 \end{aligned}$$

The 2nd term of (104) coincides with 1st term of (106) by the cyclic symmetry of $\mathfrak{c}^t$. The 2nd term of (105) coincides with 1st term of (107) by the cyclic symmetry of $\mathfrak{m}^t$.

The 1st term of (104) coincides with the 2nd term of (107). In fact

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - \langle \mathfrak{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(\mathfrak{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}), \dots), x_k \rangle \\
 &= (-1)^{1+(*i+1)(\deg' x_i + \dots + \deg' x_k)} \langle \mathfrak{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(x_i, \dots, x_k), \mathfrak{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}) \rangle \\
 &= \langle \mathfrak{m}_{k_2, \beta_2}^t(x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}), \mathfrak{c}_{k_1, \beta_1}^t(x_i, \dots, x_k) \rangle,
 \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to the 2nd term of (107).

In the same way the 1st term of (105) coincides with the 2nd term of (106). We thus proved (103). $\square$

We thus constructed cyclic filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}\}$. We remark that $\mathfrak{c}_{1, (0,0)}$ is identity and $\mathfrak{c}_{k, (0,0)} = 0$ for $k \neq 1$ by definition. We can use this fact to show that $\{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}\}$ has an inverse, by induction on energy filtration. The proof of Theorem 8.2 is complete. $\square$

10. CANONICAL MODEL OF CYCLIC FILTERED A_∞ ALGEBRA

In this section we prove Theorems 8.3 and 8.4. We first review the construction of the filtered A_∞ structure $\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}$ on H and filtered A_∞ homomorphism $\{f_{k, \beta}\} : H \rightarrow C$, from [13] Subsection 5.4.4.

We consider the chain complex $(\overline{C}, \mathfrak{m}_{1, (0,0)})$ together with its inner product. We take $\mathbb{R}$ linear subspace $\overline{H} \subset \overline{C}$ such that $\mathfrak{m}_{1, (0,0)} = 0$ on $\overline{H}$ and $\overline{H}$ is identified with the $\mathfrak{m}_{1, (0,0)}$ cohomology by an obvious map. In the case $\overline{C}$ is the de Rham complex of L we take a Riemannian metric on L and $\overline{H}$ be the space of harmonic forms.

Lemma 10.1 (Compare [18] Section 5.1.). *We assume either $\overline{C}$ is finite dimensional or is a de Rham complex. There exists a map $\Pi : \overline{C} \rightarrow \overline{C}$ of degree 0 and $G : \overline{C} \rightarrow \overline{C}$ of degree +1 with the following properties.*

- (1) $\Pi \circ \Pi = \Pi$. The image of Π is a $\overline{H}$.
- (2)

$$(108) \quad \text{identity} - \Pi = -(\mathfrak{m}_{1, (0,0)} \circ G + G \circ \mathfrak{m}_{1, (0,0)}).$$

- (3) $G \circ G = 0$.
- (4) $\langle \Pi x, y \rangle = \langle x, \Pi y \rangle$.

(5)

$$(109) \quad \langle x, Gy \rangle = (-1)^{\deg x \deg y} \langle y, Gx \rangle$$

Proof. We first assume that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is finite dimensional. We remark

$$(110) \quad \langle \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}x, y \rangle = (-1)^{\deg' x \deg' y + 1} \langle \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}y, x \rangle.$$

We put $\overline{B} = \text{Im } \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}$. (110) implies $\langle \overline{B}, \overline{H} \rangle = 0$, $\langle \overline{B}, \overline{B} \rangle = 0$. We put

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}}' = \{x \in \overline{\mathcal{C}} \mid \langle x, \overline{H} \rangle = 0\}.$$

Since $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is nondegenerate on $\overline{H}$ it follows that it is nondegenerate also on $\overline{\mathcal{C}}'$. By an easy linear algebra we can find $\overline{D} \subset \overline{\mathcal{C}}'$ such that $\overline{B} \oplus \overline{D} = \overline{\mathcal{C}}'$ and $\langle \overline{D}, \overline{D} \rangle = 0$. We thus have decomposition

$$(111) \quad \overline{\mathcal{C}} = \overline{B} \oplus \overline{D} \oplus \overline{H}.$$

We use this decomposition to define projections Π_B, Π_D, Π to $\overline{B}, \overline{D}, \overline{H}$ respectively. We have

$$(112) \quad \langle \Pi x, y \rangle = \langle x, \Pi y \rangle, \quad \langle \Pi_B x, y \rangle = \langle x, \Pi_D y \rangle, \quad \langle \Pi_D x, y \rangle = \langle x, \Pi_B y \rangle.$$

Thus we have 1 and 4.

By construction the restriction of $\mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}$ to $\overline{D}$ induces an isomorphism $\overline{D} \rightarrow \overline{B}$. Let $\mathbf{n}$ be its inverse. We put

$$(113) \quad G = -\mathbf{n} \circ \Pi_B = -\Pi_D \circ \mathbf{n} \circ \Pi_B.$$

It is easy to check 2 and 3. We will prove 5. We first show:

$$(114) \quad \langle x, \mathbf{n}(y) \rangle = (-1)^{\deg x \deg y} \langle y, \mathbf{n}(x) \rangle.$$

To prove (114) we may assume $x, y \in \overline{B}$. We put $x = \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}a$, $y = \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}b$. Then

$$\langle x, \mathbf{n}(y) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}a, b \rangle = (-1)^{\deg' a \deg' b} \langle \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}b, a \rangle = (-1)^{\deg x \deg y} \langle y, \mathbf{n}(x) \rangle$$

as required. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, G(y) \rangle &= -\langle x, \Pi_D \circ \mathbf{n} \circ \Pi_B(y) \rangle = -\langle \Pi_B(x), \mathbf{n}(\Pi_B(y)) \rangle \\ &= -(-1)^{\deg x \deg y} \langle \Pi_B(y), \mathbf{n}(\Pi_B(x)) \rangle = (-1)^{\deg x \deg y} \langle y, G(x) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 10.1 is complete in the case $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is finite dimensional. In the case of de Rham complex, we take δ the L^2 conjugate to $\mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}$ and let $\overline{D}$ be the image of it. (111) is nothing but the Hodge-Kodaira decomposition. (112) is well-known. The rest of the proof is the same. $\square$

Let $Gr(k, \beta)$ be as in Section 9. For each $\Gamma = (T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) \in Gr(k, \beta)$ we will define

$$(115) \quad \mathbf{f}_\Gamma; B_k(\overline{H}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta)$ and

$$(116) \quad \mathbf{m}_\Gamma : B_k(\overline{H}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{H}[1]$$

of degree $1 - \mu(\beta)$ by induction on $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T)$.

Suppose $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T) = 0$. Then $k = 1$. We put $\mathbf{f}_\Gamma = \text{identity}$ and $\mathbf{m}_\Gamma = \mathbf{m}_{1,(0,0)}$.

Suppose $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T) = 1$. Then $v \in C_0^{\text{int}}(T)$ has $k + 1$ edges. We put

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{f}_\Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_k) = G(\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta(v)}(x_1, \dots, x_k)), \\ \mathbf{m}_\Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \Pi(\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta(v)}(x_1, \dots, x_k)). \end{cases}$$

We next assume $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(T) \geq 2$. Let e be the edge containing v_0 and v be another vertex of e . v is necessarily interior. We remove v_0, v, e from T and obtain $T_1, \dots, T_\ell$, where v has $\ell + 1$ edges. We number T_i so that $e, T_1, \dots, T_\ell$ respects the counter clockwise cyclic order induced by the orientation of $\mathbb{R}^2$. The tree T_i , together with the data induced from Γ in an obvious way, determines $\Gamma_i \in Gr(k_i, \beta_i)$. We have $\beta = \beta(v) + \sum \beta(i)$, $k = \sum k_i$. We put

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{f}_\Gamma = G \circ \mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta(v)} \circ (\mathfrak{f}_{\Gamma_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{f}_{\Gamma_\ell}), \\ \mathfrak{m}_\Gamma = \Pi \circ \mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta(v)} \circ (\mathfrak{f}_{\Gamma_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{f}_{\Gamma_\ell}). \end{cases}$$

We now define

$$(117) \quad \mathfrak{f}_{k, \beta} = \sum_{\Gamma \in Gr(k, \beta)} \mathfrak{f}_\Gamma, \quad \mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}} = \sum_{\Gamma \in Gr(k, \beta)} \mathfrak{m}_\Gamma.$$

Lemma 10.2. $\{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}\}$ defines a structure of filtered A_∞ algebra on H .

$\{\mathfrak{f}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}\}$ defines a filtered A_∞ homomorphism $: H \rightarrow C$.

Unital and/or mod T^{E_0} versions also hold.

We omit the proof and refer [13] Subsection 5.4.4.

We next prove the cyclicity of $\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}$. We need some more notations. Let $\Gamma = (T, v_0, \beta(\cdot)) \in Gr(k, \beta)$. A *flag* of Γ is a pair (v, e) , where v is an interior vertex of T and e is an edge containing v . For each (Γ, v, e) we will define

$$(118) \quad \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma, v, e) : B_{k+1}(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

as follows. We remove v from T . Let $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_\ell$ be the component of the complement. We assume $e \in T_0$ and $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_\ell$ respects the counter clockwise cyclic order induced by the standard orientation of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Together with data induced from Γ the ribbon tree T_i determine $\Gamma_i = (T_i, v, \beta_i(\cdot)) \in Gr(k_i, \beta_i)$ such that $\beta(v) + \sum \beta_i = \beta$ and $\sum k_i = k$. (We remark that the root of Γ_i is always v by convention.)

We enumerate the exterior vertices of Γ as $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k$ so that it respects the counter clockwise cyclic order. We take j_i such that $v_{j_i}, \dots, v_{j_i+k_i-1}$ are vertices of T_i . (In case $j_i + k_i - 1 > k$ we identify $v_{j_i+k_i-1}$ with $v_{j_i+k_i-1-k}$.)

Definition 10.1.

$$(119) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma, v, e)(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0) \\ &= (-1)^* \langle \mathfrak{m}_{\ell, \beta(v)}(\mathfrak{f}_{\Gamma_1}(x_{j_1}, \dots), \dots, \mathfrak{f}_{\Gamma_\ell}(x_{j_\ell}, \dots)), \mathfrak{f}_{\Gamma_0}(x_{j_0}, \dots, x_{j_1-1}) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$* = (\deg' x_{j_1} + \deg' x_{j_1+1} + \dots + \deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{j_1-1}).$$

Proposition 10.1. $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma, v, e)(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0)$ is independent of the flag (v, e) but depends only on $\Gamma, x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0$.

Proof. Independence of e is a consequence of the cyclic symmetry of $\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}$. We will prove independence of v . Let v and v' be interior vertices. We assume that there exists an edge e joining v and v' .

We first consider the flag (v, e) . We then obtain $\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_\ell$ as above. We next consider the flag (v', e) . We then obtain $\Gamma'_0, \dots, \Gamma'_{\ell'}$ as above. It is easy to see the

following:

$$(120) \quad \begin{cases} \Gamma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_\ell \cup e \cup \Gamma'_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma'_{\ell'} = \Gamma, \\ e \cup \Gamma'_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma'_{\ell'} = \Gamma_0 \\ e \cup \Gamma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_\ell = \Gamma'_0. \end{cases}$$

Let $v_{j_i}, \dots, v_{j_i+k_i-1}$ be the vertices of Γ_i and $v_{j'_i}, \dots, v_{j'_i+k'_i-1}$ the vertices of Γ'_i . We put

$$y_i = f_{\Gamma_i}(x_{j_i}, \dots, x_{j_i+k_i-1}), \quad z_i = f_{\Gamma'_i}(x_{j'_i}, \dots, x_{j'_i+k'_i-1}).$$

Now by definitions and (120) we have

$$(121) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{m}(\Gamma, v, e)(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0) \\ &= (-1)^{*1} \langle \mathbf{m}_{\ell, \beta(v)}(y_1, \dots, y_\ell), G(\mathbf{m}_{\ell', \beta(v')}(z_1, \dots, z_{\ell'})) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where

$$*1 = (\deg' x_{j_1} + \deg' x_{j_1+1} + \dots + \deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{j_1-1}).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(122) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{m}(\Gamma, v', e)(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0) \\ &= (-1)^{*2} \langle \mathbf{m}_{\ell', \beta(v')}(z_1, \dots, z_{\ell'}), G(\mathbf{m}_{\ell, \beta(v)}(y_1, \dots, y_\ell)) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where

$$*2 = (\deg' x_{j'_1} + \deg' x_{j'_1+1} + \dots + \deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{j'_1-1}).$$

(121) coincides with (122) by (109). (We use the fact that degree of $\mathbf{m}$ is +1 here.) $\square$

Lemma 10.3. $\mathbf{m}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}$ is cyclically symmetric.

Proof. We consider

$$(123) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{m}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}(x_1, \dots, x_k), x_0 \rangle &= \sum_{\Gamma \in Gr(k, \beta)} \langle \mathbf{m}_{\Gamma}^{\text{can}}(x_1, \dots, x_k), x_0 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\Gamma \in Gr(k, \beta)} \mathbf{m}(\Gamma, (v'_0, e_0))(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Here e_0 be the edge containing v_0 (the root of Γ), and v'_0 be the other edge of e_0 .

We number exterior edges of Γ as $v_0, \dots, v_k$ so that it respects counter clockwise cyclic order. Let e_i be the edge containing v_i and let v'_i be the other vertex of e_i . Proposition 10.1 implies that (123) is equal to

$$(-1)^* \sum_{\Gamma \in Gr(k, \beta)} \mathbf{m}(\Gamma, (v'_i, e_i))(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_0).$$

Here $*$ = $(\deg' x_{i+1} + \dots + \deg' x_0)(\deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_i)$. Clearly this is equal to

$$(-1)^* \langle \mathbf{m}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}(x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i-1}), x_i \rangle$$

The proof of Lemma 10.3 is now complete. $\square$

Lemma 10.4. $\{f_{k, \beta}\}$ is cyclic.

Proof. We consider

$$(124) \quad \langle f(\Gamma_1)(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}), f(\Gamma_2)(x_{k_1+1}, \dots, x_k) \rangle$$

where $\Gamma_i \in Gr(k_i, \beta_i)$, $k_1 + k_2 = k + 1$, $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$.

We remark that the image of $f(\Gamma_i)$ is in $\overline{D} = \text{Im } G$ if $(k_i, \beta_i) \neq (1, (0, 0))$. If $(k_i, \beta_i) = (1, (0, 0))$ then the image of $f(\Gamma_i)$ is in $\overline{H}$. Moreover $\langle \overline{D}, \overline{D} \rangle = \langle \overline{D}, \overline{H} \rangle = 0$. Therefore (124) is 0 unless $(k, \beta) = (2, (0, 0))$. In the case $(k, \beta) = (2, (0, 0))$, (124) is $\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$. The lemma follows. $\square$

The proof of Theorem 8.3 is complete. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 8.4. Let $(C, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t\})$ be a pseudo-isotopy. We take G, Π as in Lemma 10.1. Since $\mathfrak{m}_{1,(0,0)}^t$ is independent of t we can choose G, Π to be independent of t . We take canonical model $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,\text{can}}\})$ for each fixed t . It is easy to see from construction that $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,\text{can}}$ is smooth with respect to t . We next define $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,\text{can}}$.

We consider a pair (Γ, v_s) of $\Gamma \in Gr(k, \beta)$ and an interior vertex v_s of Γ . We denote by $Gr^+(k, \beta)$ the set of all such pairs. We will define

$$(125) \quad \mathfrak{c}^t(\Gamma, v_s) : B_k(\overline{H}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{H}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta)$ and

$$(126) \quad \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma, v_s) : B_k(\overline{H}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{c}[1]$$

of degree $-1 - \mu(\beta)$, by induction on $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(\Gamma)$.

Since $v_s \in C_0^{\text{int}}(\Gamma)$ we have $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(\Gamma) \geq 1$.

If $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(\Gamma) = 1$ we put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma, v_s)(x_1, \dots, x_k) &= G(\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta(v_s)}^t(x_1, \dots, x_k)) \\ \mathfrak{c}^t(\Gamma, v_s)(x_1, \dots, x_k) &= \Pi(\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta(v_s)}^t(x_1, \dots, x_k)). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\#C_0^{\text{int}}(\Gamma) > 1$. Let e_1 be the edge containing v_0 and v be the other vertex of e_1 .

(Case 1): $v = v_s$.

We remove e, v, v_0 from Γ and obtain $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_\ell$. (We assume $e, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_\ell$ respects counter clockwise cyclic order.) We put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma, v_s) &= G \circ \mathfrak{c}_{\ell,\beta(v_s)}^t \circ (f^t(\Gamma_1) \otimes \dots \otimes f^t(\Gamma_\ell)), \\ \mathfrak{c}^t(\Gamma, v_s) &= \Pi \circ \mathfrak{c}_{\ell,\beta(v_s)}^t \circ (f^t(\Gamma_1) \otimes \dots \otimes f^t(\Gamma_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

Here $f^t(\Gamma)$ is the operator which appeared in the definition of $f_{k,\beta}^t$.

(Case 2): $v \neq v_s$.

We remove e, v, v_0 from Γ and obtain $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_\ell$. (We assume $e, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_\ell$ respects counter clockwise cyclic order.) We assume $v_s \in \Gamma_i$. We now put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma, v_s) &= G \circ \mathfrak{m}_{\ell,\beta(v_s)}^t \circ (f^t(\Gamma_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma_i) \otimes \dots \otimes f^t(\Gamma_\ell)), \\ \mathfrak{c}^t(\Gamma, v_s) &= -\Pi \circ \mathfrak{m}_{\ell,\beta(v_s)}^t \circ (f^t(\Gamma_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma_i) \otimes \dots \otimes f^t(\Gamma_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

Note $\mathfrak{f}^t(\Gamma)$ is of even degree and $\mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma)$ is of odd degree. We take their tensor product as follows:

$$(127) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\mathfrak{f}^t(\Gamma_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma_i) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{f}^t(\Gamma_\ell))(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ &= (-1)^{*i} \mathfrak{f}^t(\Gamma_1)(x_1, \dots, x_{k_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{h}^t(\Gamma_i)(x_j, \dots, x_{j+k_i-1}) \otimes \dots \\ & \quad \otimes \mathfrak{f}^t(\Gamma_\ell)(x_{k-k_\ell+1}, \dots, x_k). \end{aligned}$$

Here $j = k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_{i-1} + 1$, $*i = \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{j-1}$.

We remark that the minus sign in the definition of $\mathfrak{c}^t(\Gamma, v_s)$ appears since we change the order of $\mathfrak{m}_{\ell, \beta(v_s)}^T$ and dt .

We put

$$\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t\text{can}} = \sum_{(\Gamma, v_s) \in Gr^+(k, \beta)} \mathfrak{c}^t(\Gamma, v_s).$$

It is easy to see that $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t\text{can}}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t\text{can}}\})$ satisfies 1, 2, 5 of Definition 8.5. We next prove 4 by using Lemma 8.1. We consider $C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{H})$ and define $\hat{\mathfrak{m}}_{k, \beta}^{\text{can}}$ by (80). We next define

$$\mathfrak{F}_{k, \beta} : B_k(C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{H})[1]) \rightarrow C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{H})[1]$$

as follows. Let $x_i(t) + dt \wedge y_i(t) = \mathbf{x}_i \in C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{H})$. We put

$$\mathfrak{F}_{k, \beta}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = x(t) + dt \wedge y(t)$$

where

$$(128a) \quad x(t) = \mathfrak{f}_{k, \beta}^t(x_1(t), \dots, x_k(t))$$

$$(128b) \quad \begin{aligned} & y(t) = \mathfrak{h}_{k, \beta}^t(x_1(t), \dots, x_k(t)) \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{*i} \mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^t(x_1(t), \dots, x_{i-1}(t), y_i(t), x_{i+1}(t), \dots, x_k(t)) \end{aligned}$$

if $(k, \beta) \neq (1, (0, 0))$ and

$$(128c) \quad y(t) = \frac{d}{dt} x_1(t)$$

if $(k, \beta) = (1, (0, 0))$. Here $*i$ in (128b) is $*i = \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1}$. (We remark that $\mathfrak{f}_{1, (0, 0)}^t = \text{identity}$ and $\mathfrak{h}_{1, (0, 0)}^t = 0$.)

Lemma 10.5. $\{\mathfrak{F}_{k, \beta}\}$ is a filtered A_∞ homomorphism.

Proof. We regard G and Π as homomorphisms

$$C^\infty([0, 1] \times \overline{C}) \rightarrow C^\infty([0, 1] \times \overline{C}).$$

Then we can apply (the proof of) Lemma 10.2. It implies Lemma 10.5. $\square$

Corollary 10.1. $\mathfrak{c}^{t\text{can}}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^{t\text{can}}$ satisfies (79).

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{F}_{1, (0, 0)}$ is injective, Lemma 10.5 implies that $\hat{\mathfrak{m}}^{t\text{can}}$ satisfies A_∞ relation. The Corollary then follows from Lemma 8.1. $\square$

Lemma 10.6. $\mathfrak{c}^{t\text{can}}$ is cyclically symmetric.

The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 9.3 and so is omitted. The proof of Theorem 8.4 is now complete. (The proof of unitality is easy.) $\square$

11. GEOMETRIC REALIZATION OF PSEUDO-ISOTOPY OF CYCLIC FILTERED A_∞ ALGEBRAS

The main result of this section is the following Theorem 11.1. Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold and L be a relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold. We take two almost complex structures J_0, J_1 tamed by ω . Let $E_0 \leq E_1$. We apply Theorem 7.1 for L, J_0, E_0 and L, J_1, E_1 . Then we obtain $G(J_i)$ gapped cyclic filtered A_∞ structures $(\Lambda(L), \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i)}\}, \langle \cdot \rangle)$ module T^{E_i} on the de-Rham complex. (Note the discrete submonoid $G(J)$ depends on the almost complex structure J . See the beginning of the proof of Theorem 7.1.)

Theorem 11.1. *There exists $G \supset G(J_0), G(J_1)$ such that $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(0)}\})$ is pseudo-isotopic to $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(1)}\})$ as G gapped cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebras modulo T^{E_0} .*

Before proving Theorem 11.1 we clarify the definition of pseudo-isotopy in the (infinite dimensional) case of de Rham complex. We consider $\overline{C} = \Lambda(L)$. We put

$$(129) \quad C^\infty([0, 1] \times \overline{C}) = \Lambda([0, 1] \times L).$$

Note an element of $C^\infty([0, 1] \times \overline{C})$ is uniquely written as

$$x(t) + dt \wedge y(t),$$

where $x(t), y(t) \in \Lambda(L)$. So this notation is consistent with one in Section 8. However the assumption on the smoothness here on the map $t \mapsto x(t), t \mapsto y(t)$ is different from finite dimensional case.

We consider the operations $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t : B_k(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{C}[1]$ of degree $-\mu(\beta) + 1$ and $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t : B_k(\overline{C}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{C}[1]$ of degree $-\mu(\beta)$.

Definition 11.1. We say $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t$ is *smooth* if for each $x_1, \dots, x_k$

$$t \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t(x_1, \dots, x_k)$$

is an element of $C^\infty([0, 1] \times \overline{C})$.

The smoothness of $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t$ is defined in the same way.

This is the same as Definition 11.1, except we use (129) for $C^\infty([0, 1] \times \overline{C})$. We use this definition of the smoothness and define pseudo-isotopy on de-Rham complex in the same way as Definition 8.5. Theorems 8.1, 8.2 can be proved in the same way.

Proof of Theorem 11.1. We take a path $\mathcal{J} = \{J_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ of tame almost complex structures joining J_0 to J_1 . We consider the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_t)$ of J_t -holomorphic discs of homology class $\beta \in H_2(M, L; \mathbb{Z})$. We put:

$$(130) \quad \mathcal{M}_k(\beta; \mathcal{J}) = \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \{t\} \times \mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_t).$$

We have evaluation maps

$$ev = (ev_0, \dots, ev_{k-1}) : \mathcal{M}_k(\beta; \mathcal{J}) \rightarrow L^k$$

together with $ev_t : \mathcal{M}_k(\beta; \mathcal{J}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $ev_t(\{t\} \times \mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_t)) = \{t\}$.

Lemma 11.1. *There exists a system of Kuranishi structures on $\mathcal{M}_1(\beta; \mathcal{J})$ and $\mathcal{M}_0(\beta; \mathcal{J})$ with the following properties.*

- (1) ev_t extends to a strongly continuous and weakly submersive map. So it induces a Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_t)$ for each of $t \in [0, 1]$, $k = 0, 1$.
- (2) The induced Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$, $k = 0, 1$ coincides with one produced in Theorem 3.1.
- (3) For any $t \in [0, 1]$, $k = 0, 1$, the induced Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_t)$ satisfies the conclusions of Theorem 3.1.

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 3.1. Namely we define the obstruction bundle, that is a subspace of $C^\infty(\Sigma, u^*TM \otimes \Lambda^{01})$, enough large so that the submersivity of ev_0 and ev_t holds. We can do it inductively so that the part already defined are untouched. $\square$

Lemma 11.2. *There exists a system of Kuranishi structures on $\mathcal{M}_{\ell, k+1}(\beta; \mathcal{J})$ $k \geq 0$, with the following properties.*

- (1) ev_t extends to a strongly continuous and weakly submersive map. So it induces a Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_t)$ for each of $t \in [0, 1]$.
- (2) The induced Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$ coincides with one produced in Corollary 3.1.
- (3) For any $t \in [0, 1]$, the induced Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J_t)$ satisfies the conclusion of Corollary 3.1.

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Corollary 3.1. $\square$

Lemma 11.3. *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compatible systems of families of multisections $(U_{\tilde{\alpha}, i}, W_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \{\mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha}, i, j}\})$, $(U_{\alpha, i}, W_{\alpha}, \{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, i, j}\})$ on $\mathcal{M}_1(\beta; \mathcal{J})$, $\mathcal{M}_0(\beta; \mathcal{J})$ for $\beta \cap \omega \leq E_0$, with the following properties:*

- (1) At $t = 0, 1$ they coincide with the family of multisections produced in Theorem 5.1.
- (2) They are ϵ close to the Kuranishi map.
- (3) They are transversal to 0 in the sense of Definition 4.1.3.
- (4) $(ev_0, ev_t) : \mathcal{M}_1(\beta; \mathcal{J}) \rightarrow L \times [0, 1]$ induces submersions $(ev_0)_{\tilde{\alpha}}|_{\mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{-1}(0)} : \mathfrak{s}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{-1}(0) \rightarrow L \times [0, 1]$.
- (5) They are compatible with (32) in the same sense as Theorem 5.1.

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 5.1. $\square$

Remark 11.1. We remark that 4 above implies that submersivity of $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_1(\beta; J_t) \rightarrow L$ for any t . Since there exists uncountably many t 's we can not do it in case we are working with multi but finitely many valued sections. Since we are working with continuous family of multisections this becomes possible. In fact we can take the dimension of our parameter space W as large as we want.

Lemma 11.4. *For each ϵ and E_0 , there exists a system of continuous family of multisections on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; \mathcal{J})$, $k \geq 0$, $\beta \cap \omega \leq E_0$, with the following properties.*

- (1) At $t = 0, 1$ they coincide with the family of multisections produced in Corollary 5.1.
- (2) It is ϵ close to the Kuranishi map.
- (3) It is compatible with $\text{forget}_{k+1, 1}$.
- (4) It is invariant under the cyclic permutation of the boundary marked points.
- (5) It is invariant by the permutation of interior marked points.
- (6) $(ev_0, ev_t) : \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; \mathcal{J}) \rightarrow L \times [0, 1]$ induces a submersion on its zero set.

(7) We consider the decomposition of the boundary:

$$(131) \quad \partial \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; \mathcal{J}) \supset \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq j+1 \leq k+1} \bigcup_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta} \mathcal{M}_{j-i+1}(\beta_1; \mathcal{J})_{(ev_0, ev_i)} \times_{(ev_i, ev_t)} \mathcal{M}_{k-j+i}(\beta_2; \mathcal{J}).$$

Then the restriction of our family of multisections of $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; \mathcal{J})$ in the left hand side coincides with the fiber product family of multisections in the right hand side.

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Corollary 5.1. $\square$

Now we are in the position to complete the proof of Theorem 11.1. Let $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k \in \Lambda(L)$. We put

$$(132) \quad \text{Corr}_*(\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; \mathcal{J}); (ev_1, \dots, ev_k), ev_0)(\rho_1 \times \dots \times \rho_k) = \rho(t) + dt \wedge \sigma(t).$$

Here we use continuous family of multisections produced in Lemma 11.4 to define the left hand side. We define

$$(133) \quad \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^t(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k) = \rho(t), \quad \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^t(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k) = \sigma(t).$$

Using Lemma 11.4 we can prove that they satisfies the required properties in the same way as the proof of Theorem 7.1. $\square$

12. CYCLIC FILTERED A_∞ STRUCTURE ON DE-RHAM COMPLEX AND ON DE-RHAM COHOMOLOGY

In this section, we will use Theorems 7.1 and 11.1 to produce gapped, cyclic and unital filtered A_∞ structure on de Rham cohomology. We first construct cyclic filtered A_∞ structure on de Rham complex.

Theorem 12.1. *For any relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold L , we can associate a gapped cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra, $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}\})$ on its de Rham complex.*

It is independent of the choices up to pseudo-isotopy as cyclic unital filtered A_∞ modulo T^E for any E .

Proof. We fix J and take $E_1 < E_2 < \dots$. For each E_i we apply Theorem 7.1 to obtain gaped cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^{E_i} , $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i)}\})$ on de Rham complex. By Theorem 11.1 there exists a pseudo-isotopy $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,(i)}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,(i)}\})$ of gaped cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^{E_i} between $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i)}\})$ and $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i+1)}\})$. Now we use Theorem 8.2 to extend unital pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_0} , $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,(i)}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,(i)}\})$ and unital and cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^{E_0} , and $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i)}\})$ to a unital pseudo-isotopy and unital and cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra. (See [13] Subsection 7.2.8.)

Let us take two choices J_j ($j = 0, 1$) of J and perturbation etc. and obtain cyclic unital filtered A_∞ structure extending one on $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i_0,j)}\})$. We take i such that $E_i > E$. Then by construction $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i_0,j)}\})$ is pseudo-isotopic to $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i,j)}\})$ as cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra. (Here modulo T^E is

superfluous.) On the other hand, by Theorem 11.1 $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i,0)}\})$ is pseudo-isotopic to $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(i,1)}\})$ as cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra modulo T^E . The uniqueness part of Theorem 12.1 follows. $\square$

Theorems 12.1, 8.3 and 8.4 immediately imply the following.

Corollary 12.1. *For any relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold L , we can associate a gapped cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra, $(H(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}\})$ on its de Rham cohomology.*

It is independent of the choices up to homotopy equivalence as cyclic unital filtered A_∞ modulo T^E for any E .

Remark 12.1. In Corollary 12.1 we proved that the cyclic filtered A_∞ structure on the de Rham cohomology is well defined up to homotopy equivalence modulo T^E but *not* up to pseudo-isotopy modulo T^E . Theorem 8.4 implies that it is well defined up to pseudo-isotopy modulo T^E once we fix operators G and Π satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 10.1. It does not seem to be so immediate to prove its independence of G and Π up to pseudo-isotopy (modulo T^E). The proof up to homotopy equivalence follows from the fact $\mathfrak{f}$ in Theorem 8.3 is homotopy equivalence.

So Theorem 12.1 gives stronger conclusion than Corollary 12.1.

Remark 12.2. The difference between ‘up to pseudo-isotopy modulo T^E for arbitrary E ’ and ‘up to pseudo-isotopy’ is not important for most of the applications. To improve the statement of Theorem 12.1 to ‘up to pseudo-isotopy’ we need to work out ‘pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies’. We will present the detail of this construction in Section 14, for completeness.

Remark 12.3. Here we are using bifurcation method rather than cobordism method. (See [13] Subsection 7.2.14 for the comparison between these two methods.) In [13] we used cobordism method mainly. In [1] bifurcation method is used. The reason why we use bifurcation method here is related to Remark 12.1. Namely pseudo-isotopy seems stronger than homotopy equivalence.

By carefully looking the proof of Theorem 8.2, we find that they finally give the same homotopy equivalence. In fact ‘time ordered product’, which was used in [13] appears during the proof of Theorem 8.2.

13. ADIC CONVERGENCE OF FILTERED A_∞ STRUCTURE

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. We begin with the proof of properties 1 and 2 in Theorem 1.2. We define convergence used here first. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$ be a discrete submonoid. Let $\overline{C}$ be a finite dimensional $\mathbb{R}$ vector space and $C_G = \overline{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda_0^G$, $C = \overline{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda_{0, nov}$.

Definition 13.1. A sequence of elements $v_i \in C_G$ said to converge to v if

$$v_i = \sum_{\beta \in G} v_{i,\beta} T^{E(\beta)} e^{\mu(\beta)/2}, \quad v = \sum_{\beta \in G} v_\beta T^{E(\beta)} e^{\mu(\beta)/2}$$

and if each of $v_{i,\beta}$ converges to v_β in the topology of $\overline{C}$, (induced by the ordinary topology of $\mathbb{R}$.)

$v_i \in C$ said to converge to v if there exists G independent of i such that $v_i, v \in C_G$ and v_i converges to v .

Let L be a relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold of M . We take an almost complex structure J on M tamed by ω . We consider the cyclic unital filtered A_∞ algebra $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}\})$ in Theorem 12.1 and $(H(L), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{\text{can}}\})$ in Corollary 12.1. Let $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{b_1}$ be a basis of $H^1(L; \mathbb{Z})$. We take its representative as a closed one form and denote it by the same symbol. We put

$$(134) \quad \mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{b_1} x_i \mathbf{e}_i$$

with $x_i \in \Lambda_G^{(0)}$. (Namely x_i does not contain e the grading parameter of $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ and $\mathbf{x}_i \in \Lambda(L)$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$).

Lemma 13.1.

$$(135) \quad \sum_{m_0 + \dots + m_k = m} \mathbf{m}_{k+m,\beta}(\mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_{k-1}}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_k}) \\ = \frac{1}{m!} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{b_1} (\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i) x_i \right)^m \mathbf{m}_k(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k).$$

Proof. We consider the set of $(m_0, \dots, m_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ with $m_0 + \dots + m_k = m$ and denote it by $A(m)$. For each $\vec{m} = (m_0, \dots, m_k) \in A(m)$ we take a copy of $\mathcal{M}_{k+m}(\beta)$ and denote it by $\mathcal{M}_{\vec{m}}(\beta)$. We then consider the forgetful map

$$(136) \quad \text{forget}_{\vec{m}} : \mathcal{M}_{\vec{m}}(\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_k(\beta).$$

which forget 1st, $\dots$, m_0 th, $m_0 + 2$ nd, $m_0 + m_1 + 1$ st, $m_0 + m_1 + 3$ rd, and, $\dots$, $m_0 + \dots + m_i + 1$ st, $m_0 + \dots + m_i + i + 3$ rd, $\dots$ marked points. In other words, we forget the marked points where $\mathbf{b}$ are assigned in the left hand side of (135).

We consider

$$(137) \quad ev_{\vec{m}} : \mathcal{M}_{\vec{m}}(\beta) \rightarrow L^m$$

the evaluation map at the marked points which we forget in (136). We take the (continuous family of) perturbations as in Corollary 5.1. We write its zero set as $\mathcal{M}_{\vec{m}}(\beta)^s$, $\mathcal{M}_k(\beta)^s$. Since the perturbation is compatible with forgetful map there exists a map

$$(138) \quad \text{forget}_{\vec{m}}^s : \mathcal{M}_{\vec{m}}(\beta)^s \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_k(\beta)^s.$$

For each $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{M}_k(\beta)^s$ the fiber $(\text{forget}_{\vec{m}}^s)^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$ is m dimensional. Moreover we have the following. We represent $\mathbf{p}$ by (Σ, u) . Then the cycle

$$\sum_{\vec{m}} (ev_{\vec{m}})_* ((\text{forget}_{\vec{m}}^s)^{-1}(\mathbf{p}))$$

is equal to

$$\{(u(t_1), \dots, u(t_m)) \mid t_1, \dots, t_m \in [0, 1), t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_m\}$$

as currents. Here we identify $\partial\Sigma = [0, 1)$ so that 0 corresponds to the 0th boundary marked point.

Therefore we have

$$\sum_{\vec{m}} \int_{(\text{forget}_{\vec{m}}^s)^{-1}(\mathbf{p})} ev_{\vec{m}}^*(\mathbf{b} \times \dots \times \mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{m!} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{b_1} (\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i) x_i \right)^m.$$

(135) follows. ($1/m!$ is the volume of the domain $\{(t_1, \dots, t_m) \mid t_1, \dots, t_m \in [0, 1), t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_m\}$.) $\square$

Lemma 13.2.

$$(139) \quad \sum_{m_0 + \dots + m_k = m} \mathfrak{m}_{k+m, \beta}^{\text{can}}(\mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_{k-1}}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_k}) \\ = \frac{1}{m!} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{b_1} (\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i) x_i \right)^m \mathfrak{m}_k^{\text{can}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k).$$

Proof. We have

$$(140) \quad \sum_{m_0 + \dots + m_k = m} \mathfrak{f}_{k+m, \beta}(\mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_{k-1}}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_k}) \\ = \frac{1}{m!} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{b_1} (\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i) x_i \right)^m \mathfrak{f}_k(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k).$$

by its inductive construction and (135). (139) then follows from definition, (135) and (140). $\square$

Corollary 13.1.

$$(141) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m_0 + \dots + m_k = m \leq N} \mathfrak{m}_{k+m, \beta}^{\text{can}}(\mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_{k-1}}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}^{\otimes m_k}) \\ = \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{b_1} (\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i) x_i \right) \mathfrak{m}_k^{\text{can}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k).$$

Namely the left hand side converges to the right hand side in the usual topology of $H(L; \mathbb{R})$, that is the topology induced by the usual topology of $\mathbb{R}$.

The right hand side depends only on $y_i = e^{x_i}$ and $\mathbf{x}_i$. Namely it is independent of the change $x_i \mapsto x_i + 2\pi\sqrt{-1}a_i$ for $a_i \in H(L; \Lambda_{0, \text{nov}}^{\mathbb{Z}})$.

This is immediate from Lemma 13.2.

So far we consider bounding chain $\mathbf{b}$ consisting of cohomology class of degree 1. The degree zero class does not appear in the bounding cochain. We next consider the class of degree > 1 . We put

$$(142) \quad \mathbf{b}_{\text{high}} = \sum_{i > b_1} x_i \mathbf{e}_i.$$

Here $\mathbf{e}_i$, $i = b_1 + 1, \dots$ is a basis of $\bigoplus_{d \geq 1} H^{2d+1}(L; \mathbb{Z})$.

Lemma 13.3. *There exists $E(m)$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} E(m) = \infty$ and that*

$$(143) \quad T^{E(\beta)} \mathfrak{m}_{k+m, \beta}^{\text{can}}(\mathbf{b}_{\text{high}}^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}_{\text{high}}^{\otimes m_k}) \equiv 0 \pmod{T^{E(m)}}$$

if $m = m_0 + \dots + m_k$. $E(m)$ is independent of β .

Proof. By degree reason we have

$$\mu(\beta) > md + C$$

where C depends only on $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ and L . By Gromov compactness (Definition 6.2 2,3) it implies that $E(\beta) \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

We put

$$(144) \quad \mathbf{m}_k = \sum_{\beta \in G} T^{E(\beta)} e^{\mu/2} \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}.$$

Then 1,2 of Theorem 1.2 follow from Corollary 13.1 and Lemma 13.3.

We turn to the proof of 3,4 of Theorem 1.2. We take a Weinstein neighborhood U of L . Namely U is symplectomorphic to a neighborhood U' of zero section in T^*L . We choose δ_1 so that for $c = (c_1, \dots, c_b) \in [-\delta_1, +\delta_1]^b$ the graph of the closed one form $\sum_{i=1}^{b_1} c_i \mathbf{e}_i$ is contained in U' . We send it by the symplectomorphism to U and denote it by $L(c)$. We may take $\delta_2 < \delta_1$ such that if $c = (c_1, \dots, c_b) \in [-\delta_2, +\delta_2]^b$ then there exists a diffeomorphism $F_c : M \rightarrow M$ such that

$$(145) \quad F_c(L) = L(c),$$

$$(146) \quad (F_c)_* J \text{ is tamed by } \omega.$$

Remark 13.1. It is essential here to consider tame almost complex structure rather than compatible almost complex structure. In fact the compatibility is used to prove Gromov compactness which was actually proved in [17] for the tame almost complex structure. In fact we can not take F_c to be symplectomorphism in general. So in general $(F_c)_* J$ is not compatible with ω . However it is tamed by ω if c is sufficiently small. This is because the condition for almost complex structure to be tame is an open condition.

We consider the cyclic filtered A_∞ algebra $(\Lambda(L(c)), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(F_c)_* J}\})$. We compare it with $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^J\})$. (Here we include $(F_c)_* J$ and J in the notation to specify the complex structure we use.) The closed one forms $\mathbf{e}_i$ representing the basis $H^1(L; \mathbb{Z})$ is transformed to a closed one form $\mathbf{e}_i(c)$ on $L(c)$ by the diffeomorphism F_c . For $\mathbf{b}$ in (134) we put

$$\mathbf{b}_c(x_1, \dots, x_{b_1}) = \mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{b_i} (x_i \cdot (F_c)_*(\mathbf{e}_i)).$$

We define

$$\mathbf{b}_{\text{high},c}(x_{b_1+1}, \dots, x_b) = \mathbf{b}_{\text{high},c} = \sum_{i>b_1} (x_i \cdot (F_c)_*(\mathbf{e}_i))$$

and $\mathbf{b}_{c+} = \mathbf{b}_c + \mathbf{b}_{\text{high},c}$, $\mathbf{b}_+ = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}_{\text{high}}$.

Lemma 13.4. *We may choose perturbation etc. of the choices entering in the definition of $\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(F_c)_* J}$, $\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^J$ such that the following holds.*

$$(147) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{m}_{k+m, (F_c^{-1})^* \beta}^{(F_c)_* J} (\mathbf{b}_{c+}^{\otimes m_0}, (F_c^{-1})^* \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{b}_{c+}^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{c+}^{\otimes m_{k-1}}, (F_c^{-1})^* \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}_{c+}^{\otimes m_k}) \\ &= \mathbf{m}_{k+m, \beta}^J (\mathbf{b}_+^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{b}_+^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_+^{\otimes m_{k-1}}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}_+^{\otimes m_k}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We remark that F_c gives an isomorphism

$$(148) \quad (F_c)_* : \mathcal{M}_k(\beta; J) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_k((F_c)_* \beta; (F_c)_* J).$$

We can extend this isomorphism to one of Kuranishi structures. Therefore we can take the continuous family of perturbations in Corollary 5.1 so that it is preserved by (148). The lemma follows immediately. $\square$

Lemma 13.5. *If $\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i = g_i$ then*

$$(F_c)_*(\beta) \cap (F_c^{-1})^*(\mathbf{e}_i) = \beta \cap \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{b_1} c_j g_j.$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that $F_c(L) = L(c)$ is the graph of $\sum c_i \mathbf{e}_i$. $\square$

Let $\mathbf{b}_+ = \sum_i x_i \mathbf{e}_i$. We put $y_i = e^{x_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, b_1$ and $\vec{x} = (y_1, \dots, y_{b_1}, x_{b_1+1}, \dots, x_b)$. We define

$$(149) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(F_c)_*J,\vec{x}}((F_c^{-1})^*\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, (F_c^{-1})^*\mathbf{x}_k) \\ &= \sum_m \sum_{m=m_0+\dots+m_k} T^{(F_c)_*(\beta) \cap \omega} e^{\mu(\beta)/2} \\ & \quad \mathbf{m}_{k+m, (F_c^{-1})^*\beta}^{(F_c)_*J}(\mathbf{b}_{c_+}^{\otimes m_0}, (F_c^{-1})^*\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, (F_c^{-1})^*\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}_{c_+}^{\otimes m_k}). \end{aligned}$$

We write

$$(150) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{J,\vec{x}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) \\ &= \sum_m \sum_{m=m_0+\dots+m_k=m} T^{\beta \cap \omega} e^{\mu(\beta)/2} \mathbf{m}_{k+m,\beta}^J(\mathbf{b}_+^{\otimes m_0}, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{b}_+^{\otimes m_k}). \end{aligned}$$

We put

$$\vec{x}(c) = (T^{c_1} y_1, \dots, T^{c_{b_1}} y_{b_1}, x_{b_1+1}, \dots, x_b).$$

Then Lemmas 13.4, 13.5 imply

$$(151) \quad \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(F_c)_*J,\vec{x}}((F_c^{-1})^*\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, (F_c^{-1})^*\mathbf{x}_k) = \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{J,\vec{x}(c)}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k)$$

We apply Corollary 12.1 to $L(c)$ and $(F_c)_*J$. Then the sum of left hand side of (151) over β converges for $y_i \in 1 + \Lambda_{0,nov}^+$ and $v(x_i) > -\delta$ ($i = b_1+1, \dots$). Therefore the sum of the right hand side of (151) over β also converges there. Hence by taking various c_i we obtain 3,4 of Theorem 1.2. $\square$

Remark 13.2. By the construction of this section, we can prove a similar convergence result for the pseudo-isotopy we constructed in Sections 11, 12, 14. Therefore the family of unital cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras in Theorem 1.2.4 is well defined up to homotopy equivalence of unital cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras.

14. PSEUDO-ISOTOPY OF PSEUDO-ISOTOPIES

Let $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ be a finite dimensional $\mathbb{R}$ vector space or de Rham complex $\Lambda(L)$. The vector space $C^\infty([0, 1]^2, \overline{\mathcal{C}})$ is the set of all smooth maps $[0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Let $C^\infty([0, 1]^2 \times \overline{\mathcal{C}})$ be the set of formal expression

$$(152) \quad x(t, s) + dt \wedge y(t, s) + ds \wedge z(t, s) + dt \wedge ds \wedge w(t, s)$$

where $x(t, s), y(t, s), z(t, s), w(t, s) \in C^\infty([0, 1]^2 \times \overline{\mathcal{C}})$. We define degree by putting $\deg dt = \deg ds = 1$.

In the case of de Rham complex $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \Lambda(L)$ we put

$$C^\infty([0, 1]^2 \times \overline{\mathcal{C}}) = \Lambda([0, 1]^2 \times L).$$

(In this case also an element of $\Lambda([0, 1]^1 \times L)$ can be uniquely written as (152).)

We assume that, for each $(t, s) \in [0, 1]^2$, we have operations:

$$(153) \quad \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s} : B_k(\overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta) + 1$,

$$(154) \quad \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s} : B_k(\overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{C}}[1], \quad \mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{t,s} : B_k(\overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta)$ and

$$(155) \quad \mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^t : B_k(\overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{C}}[1]$$

of degree $-\mu(\beta) - 1$. We assume that they are smooth in the following sense:

$$(s, t) \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in C^\infty([0, 1], \overline{\mathcal{C}})$$

and similarly for $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}, \mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}, \mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}$. We use them to define

$$(156) \quad \mathfrak{M}_{k,\beta} : B_k(C^\infty([0, 1]^2 \times \overline{\mathcal{C}})[1]) \rightarrow C^\infty([0, 1]^2 \times \overline{\mathcal{C}}),$$

as follows. Let

$$\mathbf{x}_i = x_i(t, s) + dt \wedge y_i(t, s) + ds \wedge z_i(t, s) + dt \wedge ds \wedge w_i(t, s)$$

We put

$$\mathfrak{M}_{k,\beta}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = x(t, s) + dt \wedge y(t, s) + ds \wedge z(t, s) + dt \wedge ds \wedge w(t, s)$$

where $x(t, s), y(t, s), z(t, s), w(t, s)$ are defined as follows.

$$(157a) \quad x(t, s) = \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)).$$

$$(157b) \quad \begin{aligned} y(s, t) = & \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)) \\ & + \sum (-1)^{*i} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, y_i(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)) \end{aligned}$$

where $*i = \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} + 1$.

$$(157c) \quad \begin{aligned} z(s, t) = & \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)) \\ & + \sum (-1)^{*i} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, z_i(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)). \end{aligned}$$

$$(157d) \quad \begin{aligned} w(s, t) = & \mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)) \\ & + \sum (-1)^{*i} \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, z_i(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)) \\ & + \sum (-1)^{*i} \mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, y_i(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)) \\ & + \sum_{i < j} (-1)^{*ij} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, y_i(t, s), \dots, z_j(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)) \\ & + \sum_{i > j} (-1)^{*ij} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}(x_1(t, s), \dots, z_j(t, s), \dots, y_i(t, s), \dots, x_k(t, s)). \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} *i^1 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} \\ *i^2 &= \deg' x_1 + \dots + \deg' x_{i-1} \\ *ij^3 &= \deg' y_i + \deg' x_{i+1} + \dots + \deg' x_{j-1} \\ *ij^4 &= 1 + \deg' z_i + \deg' x_{i+1} + \dots + \deg' x_{j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case $(k, \beta) = (1, (0, 0))$ we put

$$\begin{aligned} x(t, s) &= \mathfrak{m}_{1, (0, 0)}(x_1(t, s)) \\ y(t, s) &= \frac{d}{dt}x_1(t, s) - \mathfrak{m}_{1, (0, 0)}(y_1(t, s)) \\ z(t, s) &= \frac{d}{ds}x_1(t, s) - \mathfrak{m}_{1, (0, 0)}(z_1(t, s)) \\ w(s, t) &= \frac{d}{ds}y_1(t, s) - \frac{d}{dt}z_1(t, s) + \mathfrak{m}_{1, (0, 0)}(w_1(t, s)). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 14.1. We say $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{e}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\})$ is a *pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies* if the following holds.

- (1) $\mathfrak{M}_{k, \beta}$ satisfies filtered A_∞ formula (61).
- (2) $\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}, \mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}, \mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}, \mathfrak{e}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}$ are all cyclically symmetric.
- (3) $\mathfrak{m}_{k, (0, 0)}^{t, s}$ is independent of t, s . Moreover $\mathfrak{c}_{k, (0, 0)}^{t, s}, \mathfrak{d}_{k, (0, 0)}^{t, s}, \mathfrak{e}_{k, (0, 0)}^{t, s}$ are all zero.

Unital and/or mod T^{E_0} version is defined in the same way.

If $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{e}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\})$ is a pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies. Then, for each $s_0 \in [0, 1]$, $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s_0}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s_0}\})$ is a pseudo-isotopy, and, for each $t_0 \in [0, 1]$, $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t_0, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t_0, s}\})$ is also a pseudo-isotopy. We call them the restrictions.

Theorem 14.1. Let $E_0 < E_1$. Let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t_0, s_0}\})$ be cyclic filtered A_∞ algebras modulo T^{E_1} for $s_0, t_0 \in \{0, 1\}$. For $s_0 = 0, 1$, let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s_0}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s_0}\})$ be a pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_1} . For $t_0 = 1$, let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t_0, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t_0, s}\})$ be a pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_1} .

Let $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{e}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\})$ be a pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies modulo T^{E_0} .

We assume that the restriction of pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies to $s_0 = 0, 1$ or to $t_0 = 1$ coincides with the above pseudo-isotopy as pseudo-isotopies modulo T^{E_0} .

We assume Assumption 14.1 below.

Then, $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{e}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\})$ extends to a pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies modulo T^{E_1} so that its restriction to $s_0 = 0, 1$ or to $t_0 = 1$ coincides with the above pseudo-isotopy as pseudo-isotopies modulo T^{E_1} .

The unital version also holds.

Remark 14.1. This theorem is a cyclic and de Rham version of [13] Theorem 7.2.212.

Assumption 14.1. (1) If $E(\beta) < E_0$ then $\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}, \mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}, \mathfrak{e}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}$ are 0 in a neighborhood of $\{0, 1\}^2$ and $\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}$ is locally constant there.
(2) If $E(\beta) < E_1$ then $\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s_0}$ ($s_0 = 0, 1$) is zero if t is in a neighborhood of $\{0, 1\}$. Moreover $\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t_0, s}$ is zero if s is in a neighborhood of $\{0, 1\}$. Furthermore $\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s_0}, \mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t_0, s}$ are locally constant there.

We remark that by the method of the proof of Lemma 8.2, we may change $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\}, \{\mathfrak{e}_{k, \beta}^{t, s}\})$ so that it satisfies Assumption 14.1.

Proof of Theorem 14.1. We take a map

$$h = (h_t(u, v), h_s(u, v)) : [0, 1]_u \times [0, 1]_v \rightarrow [0, 1]_t \times [0, 1]_s$$

with the following properties. (We write $[0, 1]_s$ etc. to show that the parameter of this factor is s .)

- (1) $h(u, 0) = (1, 0)$, $h(u, 1) = (1, 1)$.
- (2) $h(1, v) = (1, v)$.
- (3) $h(0, 1/3) = (0, 0)$. $h(0, 2/3) = (0, 1)$.
- (4) The restriction of h determines a homeomorphism:

$$[0, 1]^2 \setminus ([0, 1] \times \{0\}) \rightarrow [0, 1]^2 \setminus (([0, 1] \times \{0, 1\}) \cup \{0\} \times [0, 1])$$

- (5) It is a diffeomorphism outside $\{(0, 1/3), (0, 2/3)\}$ of the domain and $\{(0, 0), (0, 1)\}$ of the target.

In particular h determines a homeomorphism

$$(158) \quad \{0\} \times [0, 1]_v \cong (\{0\} \times [0, 1]_s) \cup ([0, 1]_t \times \{0, 1\}).$$

$(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{0,s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{0,s}\})$ and $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s_0}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s_0}\})$ define pseudo-isotopies parametrized by the target of (158). We pull it back by (158) and obtain a pseudo-isotopy $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{0,v}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{0,v}\})$ modulo T^{E_1} parametrized by $[0, 1]_v$. (The pull back is defined by a similar formula as (81). We use Assumption 14.1 to show the smoothness of the pull back at $v = 1/3, 2/3$.)

We next pull back $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\}, \{\mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\})$ by h as follows. We consider

$$\begin{aligned} dh_t &= \frac{dh_t}{du} du + \frac{dh_t}{dv} dv, & dh_s &= \frac{dh_s}{du} du + \frac{dh_s}{dv} dv, \\ dh_t \wedge dh_s &= \left(\frac{dh_t}{du} \frac{dh_s}{dv} - \frac{dh_t}{dv} \frac{dh_s}{du} \right) du \wedge dv, \end{aligned}$$

and put

$$(159) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{u,v} &= \frac{dh_t}{du} \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{h(u,v)} + \frac{dh_s}{du} \mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{h(u,v)}, \\ \mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{u,v} &= \frac{dh_t}{dv} \mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{h(u,v)} + \frac{dh_s}{dv} \mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{h(u,v)}, \\ \mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^{u,v} &= \left(\frac{dh_t}{du} \frac{dh_s}{dv} - \frac{dh_t}{dv} \frac{dh_s}{du} \right) \mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^{h(u,v)}. \end{aligned}$$

(We use Assumption 14.1 to show that the pull back is smooth.) It may be regarded as a pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_0} from the pull back of $(C^\infty([0, 1] \times \overline{C}), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{0,v}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{0,v}\})$ to the restriction of $(C, \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\}, \{\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\}, \{\mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\}, \{\mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^{t,s}\})$ to the line $s = 1$. We now apply Theorem 8.2 and extend $\mathfrak{c}_{k,\beta}^{u,v}$, $\mathfrak{d}_{k,\beta}^{u,v}$, $\mathfrak{e}_{k,\beta}^{u,v}$ so that we obtain isotopy of isotopy module T^{E_1} .

Therefore we pull back again by the inverse of h to obtain required isotopy of isotopies. The proof of Theorem 14.1 is complete. $\square$

Now the main result of this section is:

Theorem 14.2. *The cyclic unital filtered A_∞ structure in Theorem 12.1 is independent of the choices up to pseudo-isotopy.*

Proof. The proof is similar to [13] Subsection 7.2.13.

We take tame almost complex structures J_0 and J_1 and $E_0 < \dots < E_i \dots$. We use J_0 and E_i to define cyclic filtered A_∞ structures $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(0,i)}\})$ modulo T^{E_i} and pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_i} $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,(0,i)}\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,(0,i)}\})$ between $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(0,i)}\})$ and $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(0,i+1)}\})$. We then extend them to cyclic filtered A_∞ structures and pseudo-isotopies. We next use J_1 and E_i to define $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(1,i)}\})$ and $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,(1,i)}\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,(1,i)}\})$. And extend them to cyclic filtered A_∞ structures and pseudo-isotopies.

To prove Theorem 14.2 it suffices to show that the extension of $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(0,i)}\})$ is pseudo-isotopic to the extension of $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(1,i)}\})$.

Theorem 11.1 implies that there exists a pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_i} , $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{s,i}\}, \{\mathbf{d}_{k,\beta}^{s,i}\})$ between $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(0,i)}\})$ and $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{(1,i)}\})$.

Lemma 14.1. *There exists a pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_i} , $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{t,s;i}\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^{t,s;i}\}, \{\mathbf{d}_{k,\beta}^{t,s;i}\}, \{\mathbf{e}_{k,\beta}^{t,s;i}\})$ so that its restriction to $t = j$ ($j = 0, 1$) coincides with $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{s,i+j}\}, \{\mathbf{c}_{k,\beta}^{s,i+j}\})$ as pseudo-isotopy modulo $T^{E_{i+j}}$. Moreover its restriction to s_j ($j = 0, 1$) coincides with $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{s,i}\}, \{\mathbf{d}_{k,\beta}^{s,i}\})$ as pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_i} .*

Proof. We construct two parameter family of Kuranishi structures and multisections, in a way similar to Section 11. Then we use it to construct pseudo-isotopy of pseudo-isotopies in the same way as (133). $\square$

By Lemma 14.1 and Theorem 14.1 we can extend the pseudo-isotopy modulo T^{E_i} $(\Lambda(L), \langle \cdot \rangle, \{\mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}^{s,i}\}, \{\mathbf{d}_{k,\beta}^{s,i}\})$ to a pseudo-isotopy. The proof of Theorem 14.2 is complete. $\square$

The uniqueness part of Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorems 14.2, 8.1 and 8.2.

KYOTO UNIVERSITY
KITASHIRAKAWA, SAKYO-KU,
KYOTO 602-8502,
JAPAN
e-mail: fukaya@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Akaho and D. Joyce *Immersed Lagrangian Floer theory*, Preprint, arXiv: 0803.071701.
- [2] C.-H. Cho, *Strong homotopy inner product of an A_∞ algebra*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **13** (2008).
- [3] C.-H. Cho, *Non-displaceable Lagrangian submanifolds and Floer cohomology with non-unitary line bundle*, J. Geom. Phys. **58** (2008), 1465–1476.
- [4] K. Fukaya, *Floer homology for families - a progress report*, Contemp. Math. **309** (2002) 33–68.
- [5] K. Fukaya, *Mirror symmetry of Abelian varieties and multi-theta function*, J. Algebraic Geom. **11** 393–512 (2002).
- [6] K. Fukaya, *Application of Floer homology of Lagrangian submanifolds to symplectic topology*, Morse Theoretic Methods in Nonlinear Analysis and in Symplectic Topology, NATO Science Series II: Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry, Vol. **217**, 2005, 231–276.
- [7] K. Fukaya, *Differentiable operad, Kuranishi correspondence, and foundation of topological field theories based on pseudo-holomorphic curve*, to appear in ‘Arithmetic and Geometry around Quantization’, Birkhäuser.

- [8] K. Fukaya, *Counting pseudo-holomorphic discs in Calabi-Yau 3-fold*, in preparation.
- [9] K. Fukaya, *Sheaf of filtered A_∞ functors*, in preparation.
- [10] K. Fukaya, *Homological mirror functor in dimension 2*, in preparation.
- [11] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory – Anomaly and obstructions* 2000 Preprint. Kyoto-Math 00-17. Available at <http://www.math.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~fukaya/fukaya.html>.
- [12] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory – Anomaly and obstructions* – 2006 version, Preprint.
- [13] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory – Anomaly and obstructions* to appear in AMS/IP studies in advanced Math.
- [14] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds I*, to appear in Duke. Math. J., arXiv:0802.1703.
- [15] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds II : Bulk deformation*, 2008, arXiv:0810.5774.
- [16] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, *Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariant*, Topology **38** (1999), no. 5, 933–1048.
- [17] M. Gromov, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic geometry*, Invent. Math. **82** (1985) 307–347.
- [18] H. Kajiura, *Noncommutative homotopy algebra associated with open strings*, Rev. Math. Phys. **19** (2007), 1–99.
- [19] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Homological mirror symmetry and torus fibrations* in “Symplectic Geometry and Mirror Symmetry” (2001), 203–263, World Sci. Publishing River Edge.
- [20] T. Tradler, *Infinity inner products*, preprint, arXiv.math/0108027.